

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

From the collection of the

o Pre^{z n m}inger^a
Library
v q s
t s w p

San Francisco, California
2007



THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

MAY AND AUGUST, 1852.

VOLUME XVII.

AMERICAN EDITION, VOL. XII.

NEW YORK :
PUBLISHED BY LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,
79 FULTON STREET, CORNER OF GOLD.

1852.

THE

NOTICE OF THE REVOLUTION
LAWYER'S OFFICE

THE

THE

THE

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

No. XXXIII.

FOR MAY, 1852.

- ART. I.—1. *History of the Whig Administration of 1830.* By J. A. ROEBUCK. London, 1852.
2. *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, III., IV., V., and VI. By THOMAS CARLYLE. London, 1850.
3. *The Statesman.* By HENRY TAYLOR. London, 1836.

In a country in which action is so rapid, interests so varied, and occupation so intense and unremitting, as with us—where men of business, philosophers, and politicians, pursue each their own special object with exclusive and overestimating eagerness—where the whole nation is engaged with healthy cheerfulness in unremitting effort and an unpausing race, it is not easy for those to find a hearing who would call upon the actors in this exciting drama to draw up for a brief space, and consider themselves, their position, and their aims, as becomes beings

“Holding large discourse,
Looking before and after.”

Yet these breathing moments in the hasting course of time—these Sabbatical hours of the world's quick existence—in which we may review the past, estimate where we are standing, and ascertain whither we are tending, in which we may calculate our progress and catch a clear vision of our goal, may take stock of our acquisitions and achievements, investigate the value of our objects, and compare them with the price we are paying for them, and the means which remain to us of obtaining them—such pauses for reflection, introspection, and foresight, are particularly necessary if we would not sink from the dignity of men

“Who know themselves, and know the ways before them,
And from among them choose considerately,
With a clear foresight, not a blindfold courage;
And having chosen, with a steadfast mind Pursue their purposes”—

into mere unconscious instruments of destiny, mere unresisting floaters on the stream of time.

In politics especially, a mere “hand-to-mouth” existence—living, as the French express it, *au jour le jour*—can never be worthy of men who boast to be free and claim to be progressive. Yet it is the besetting peril, and has always been the peculiar reproach of our busy British statesmen. Overwhelmed as they constantly are with a mass of routine work, which must be got through; and having literally to fight their way inch by inch against a host of antagonists, whose sole business is antagonism; knowing that every step will be a struggle, and therefore, naturally enough, stepping less where they wish and think they *ought* than where they must and think they *can*, they can rarely get sufficiently out of the press and throng to see far, or sufficiently free from the urgent demands of the moment to deliberate or muse. The position *apart*, the dry ground of security *above*, which are indispensable to the profound and patient thought out of which wisdom emerges, are almost wholly denied them. The country, too, seems content that it should be so; it is satisfied to be served by men who do the duties of the day with capacity and decorum; it is never “over-exquisite to cast the shadow of uncertain evils;” it goes on from generation to generation, meeting unforeseen emergencies with extemporized expedients, stopping up a gap

with anything that comes to hand, caulking a shot-hole with the nearest hat, slitting open the leather where the shoe pinches, putting in a casual patch when the rent in the old garment becomes absolutely indecent and unbearable, cobbling up the old house as the family enlarges, or the roof decays, or the walls crumble and fall away, adding here a buttress and there a shed, and sometimes, in a crisis of severe pressure or unwonted ambition, joining a Grecian colonnade to a Gothic gable. In this strange style we have proceeded almost for centuries, till the incongruities of our dwellings, our clothing, and our policy, have grown obvious even to our own unobservant and accustomed eye. We go on swearing against the Pretender long after his last descendant has been laid quietly in a foreign grave; guarding with testy jealousy against the power of the Crown long after the Crown has been shorn of its due and legitimate authority; risking the loss of our liberties from foreign aggression rather than support an adequate standing army, because in past times those liberties were threatened by a standing army in the hands of a domestic tyrant; exacting oaths in a court of justice as a security for truth long after experience and reflection have shewn us that those who refuse oaths are the most truthful of all witnesses, and long after our inconsistent liberality has extorted from us the permission to every man to swear after his own fashion;—and committing a host of similar solecisms, all shewing how entirely we are still governed by the ideas and traditions of an obsolete and inapplicable age. In an era of new requirements and encircled by new conditions, we are drawing on the arsenals and speaking in the language of the past; and while young and mighty perils, from hitherto undreamed of quarters, are threatening the precious commonwealth, we are haunted by the ghost of some ancestral enemy, or are gibbetting the carcase and demolishing the tomb of some old danger that was long ago gathered to its fathers.

Our present object is to awaken among our countrymen some degree, not of uneasiness, indeed, but of perception of our dangers and our requirements, some serious and anxious inquiry into the difficulties which we have to meet and into our means of meeting them. Our foreign and international relations are becoming strangely complicated; and the principles which are to guide them in future require to be considered and decided, that our due influence be not impaired by weakness or vacillation. Our relations with our offsets and dependencies are changing and enlarging with the

lapse of time; and the principles which are to regulate our colonial policy for the future must be discussed and laid down in such a manner as to avoid any risk of a disruption of our empire or of dissension among brethren. The social problems which press upon us for solution at home become daily knottier, more urgent, and more complex; and it is essential both to our safety and our welfare that they be neither evaded nor postponed. Finally, the duties of actual administration become every year more difficult and laborious as our wealth and numbers multiply, as our vision of what is needed becomes keener, and as our standard of requirement becomes higher. Now, for all these calls, but most especially for the last, we need statesmen not only of a high but of a peculiar order of talent; and as these calls increase and enlarge we require both more numerous and more able statesmen. Already it is felt that the work in every public department is augmenting and its difficulties thickening in a most perplexing degree. We are opening our eyes to the extent to which we have been misgoverned, and we are rapidly raising our conception of what Government might or ought to be; day by day defects are being discovered and abuses are being ferretted out and exposed in every ministerial office; and the voice of the country demands that they shall be remedied at once and shall be precluded for the future. We need more and exact more from our public men than at any former period. What means have our public men of meeting this need and these exactions? and what is our immediate prospect of a supply of statesmen adapted to the functions and equal to the necessities of their position?

Perhaps there has never been a period in our recent history where so poor a present had the prospect of being succeeded by a still poorer future. Generally speaking, each of the great parties in the State has been able to muster a sufficient number of men to form a Cabinet capable of undertaking the destinies of the country,—men whose views, indeed, we might deem erroneous, but of whose proved capacity there could be no question. Now, it is probable, that if an accident or an epidemic were to sweep off three or four of our oldest and most acknowledged leaders—whose end in the natural course of events cannot be far distant—all parties together could scarcely supply the fifteen ministers needed to complete a cabinet, of individuals whose fitness for such a position has been tried and is admitted by the nation. Our list of actual statesmen is alarmingly scanty; our list of

potential ones is scantier still. Peel and Wellington—the great parliamentary and the great military genius of the age—have both passed off the stage. After a life of toil, the one has found rest and the other is hourly looking forward to it. Who remain to replace them? Of the veterans who, by universal consent, hold a first rank, there are only four—Lord John Russell, Lord Derby, Lord Palmerston, and Sir James Graham. (We need take no account of their contemporaries, for Lord Lansdowne, never brilliant, but always sensible and moderate, is now seventy-two years of age, and is weary, broken down, and anxious for immediate retirement; Lord Aberdeen amiable and honourable, but yielding and inefficient, is now sixty-eight, and may, without disrespect, be spoken of in the preterite tense; Mr. Herries and Mr. Goulburn both verging on their seventieth year, were always more or less so.) But the four above named are all first-rate men. We may dissent from their policy, we may oppose their measures, we may dislike their persons, but it is impossible not to admit their full competency. Lord Derby is a gallant and brilliant nobleman; Lord John Russell is a statesman of thorough education and long experience and chivalric honour; Sir James Graham is unquestionably the ablest administrator in Parliament; and Lord Palmerston, beyond rivalry, the most complete and skilful diplomatist of his time. But these four are all of that rank and standing that remain to us; and Lord Derby, the youngest of them, is such a martyr to the gout, as almost, if not quite, to disqualify him for the toils of office. Far from being always ready for any call, he can never foresee whether he will be able to go down to the House on any given day, or whether he may not, for weeks at a time, be as unfit for business as the first Lord Chatham. Lord John Russell, whose health was never strong, is now sixty years of age; Sir James Graham the same; and Lord Palmerston is sixty-eight. When these men fail or disappear, as they soon must, who are they who will step into their places by right of natural inheritance?—the younger statesmen of the second rank.

It is in this class that our poverty is most apparent. It affords only three men qualified by capacity and character for the chief offices of State—Lord Clarendon, Lord Grey, and Mr. Gladstone. On these men we may soon have to place our main reliance. The first is already marked out by the general voice as our future Premier. He, of all men, would be best fitted to unite all that remains of vigour and adaptability in the old Whig party with the rising

talent and bolder views of the more able Radicals, and to command the allied forces. He has high rank and aristocratic connexions; he is noted for firm purpose and conciliating manners; he has shewn first-rate ability, both as a diplomatist and an administrator; whatever he has had to do he has done well; his views are sound, comprehensive, and generous; and he is free from those narrow trammels of connexion and tradition which so often cloud the vision, complicate the measures, and paralyze the energy of Lord John Russell. Moreover, though a man of thoroughly broad and statesmanlike capacity, and nothing of a *doctrinaire*, he is known to sympathize more largely than any of his class with the opinions of the more sober and reflective of the popular party; he will be freer than any other statesman to act as he deems right, because more exempt than any other from embarrassing antecedents; and the skill and courage with which he has governed Ireland, afford a guarantee of his competency to the far easier task of governing England. Happily he is still young (52,) and may possibly be our pilot for nearly a quarter of a century before his powers decay. His brother, Charles Villiers, fought the battle of the Corn-laws side by side with Richard Cobden, and he himself was known to sympathize largely with the people in that memorable contest.

Mr. Gladstone is a man whom everybody respects, and whom all who know him love. He has many of the qualities of an English statesman—wide knowledge, thorough training, a conservative temper, and singular caution. He is, moreover, a man of unstained and lofty character, gentle and generous feelings, and a most sensitive and elaborate conscientiousness. But the tone of his mind is delicate and fine rather than strong; he is inclined to scholastic niceties which greatly impair his efficiency in political life; and though his mental and moral qualities will always make him influential, yet his subtle and refining temperament will prevent him from ever becoming a popular statesman. He may be a valuable adviser and a useful moderator, even perhaps a fair administrator, but scarcely a great leader.

Lord Grey raised great hopes of his future eminence and usefulness so long as he was out of office. “*Omnium consensu capax imperii, nisi imperasset.*” Though always deplorably tainted with some of the worst faults of the Whig aristocracy—their narrow sympathies, imperious dogmatism, and cold haughtiness of temper—he was a laborious and thoughtful politician. His

views were always worthy of attention, often original, sometimes bold and comprehensive. He promised to become what England so much wants—a philosophical reformer. But office—that great test and touchstone of genuine capacity—has not only lowered his reputation, but we fear has damaged it so effectually as to render him almost unavailable for future service. Not only has he disappointed all hopes, made innumerable enemies, and done nothing well, but all his early defects seem to have been aggravated; and any such improvement as will again qualify him to become a leading statesman can scarcely be hoped for from a man who is too impatient to listen, and too proud to learn.

It may seem strange that in our survey of the prospective servants of the country, we should pass over such members of the late Cabinet as Sir Francis Baring, Mr. Fox Maule, Lord Carlisle, and Mr. Labouchere. But the first has never been esteemed a man either of much diligence or of great capacity, and is understood to have a rooted dislike to the fatigues and annoyances of office. The second is a man of talent and industry, but has scarcely made his way into the category of statesmen. Lord Carlisle, though he has been a laborious and most useful minister in his day, and though his genial manners, genuine, wide, warm benevolence, and ready popular sympathies, will always make him an ornament and a source of confidence to any Cabinet which he may join, is unquestionably not a man of commanding ability. He is an honour to his station and his country, but he would be the first to confess his own incapacity for the position of a leader. Sir George Grey's health is quite broken. Mr. Labouchere is a soft-minded, philanthropic, and honourable man—one of that class of rich, cultivated, noble country gentlemen, of whom England has so much reason to be proud; but his talents are only moderate, and he has far too little ambition to allow us to count upon him as a permanent candidate for office. Two noblemen remain, of whom the highest hopes are entertained by those who know them, and who will probably henceforth take rank among our leading statesmen—Lord Granville and Lord Dalhousie. Both are in the prime of life, and seem endowed with all the needful qualifications; but they can scarcely yet be said to have been sufficiently proved for us to predict their future with any certainty. Of those younger still, three have already appeared above the horizon, and may become stars in time. All are men of talent, and of high name and connexion. The Duke of Argyll has mani-

festated already in his writings comprehensive views and a masterly logical faculty, and seems resolved to devote himself to public life. Lord Stanley, though an inferior man to his father, and though he has most injudiciously and prematurely announced his attachment to the falling cause of protection, is said to possess very considerable powers. Mr. Frederick Peel is cautious, able, and fond of work, and has avoided his father's early fault, ranking himself at once among the moderate but advancing liberals.

Here ends our list of rising and proximate statesmen from all the great parties which have hitherto divided political power between them, and it must be allowed to be an alarmingly meagre one. We do not mean that among the holders, past and present, of the subordinate ministerial offices there are not several men of great ability, whose capacity to render good service to their country we in no way doubt. Lord Stanley of Alderley is a man of respectable powers and business habits, and Mr. Wilson is a politician and administrator of vast industry and no ordinary talent; but the number of such men is not large, and they are not *leaders*, nor perhaps qualified to be so. "But," it will be asked, "are there in Parliament no other men of capacity and eminence, who, if not yet finished statesmen, are, at all events, fitted to become such; who, though hitherto undreamed of for official posts, are yet only excluded by virtue of their opinions; and who, as the country gradually advances in the career of liberalism, will become the exponents of its views, and therefore the natural administrators of its destinies?"—We think not.* Mere opinions exclude men only for a time: character and habits of mind exclude them for ever. In the first case, their day inevitably comes round: in the second, no lapse of years and no change of public sentiments can float them in to power. Now there are at present five men of great weight, and value, and prominence in the House of Commons, whom no one thinks of with much hope—scarcely even without dread—as possible ministers. It seems generally felt, and not among aristocratic and official circles only, that, notwithstanding their undoubted ability and vigour, their natural

* This was written before the formation of the present Cabinet, the list of whose members has amazed the world. But we do not feel disposed to alter or qualify any of our observations. With the exception of Mr. Herries, (who is *passé*), the only known member of that Cabinet in the House of Commons, is Mr. Disraeli, of whom all that can be said is, that, as far as he can be judged of by the past, he unites the maximum of parliamentary cleverness with the minimum of statesmanlike capacity.

and permanent place is in the opposition. They either have not the needful endowments of statesmen, or they have qualities and defects which neutralize and overpower these endowments. Mr. Disraeli is the apparent leader of a party, is undoubtedly its spokesman, and is by far the most brilliant and formidable rhetorician in the House. His prominence there, if backed by the suitable qualities, would indubitably make him a Cabinet minister and Secretary of State if ever the Tories, or their ghosts, the Protectionists, came into power. The House always fills to hear him speak; and the fierce and polished sarcasms which he launches on his opponents are the nightly delight of his associates. Yet no one ever dreams of him as a leading minister. The country would not endure his appointment to any important post, and his undeniable Parliamentary claim to such is well known to be a source of serious embarrassment to his party. He is felt by all parties to be a mere adventurer,—a man without fixed principles or deliberate and sincere public aims,—a man to whom political life is a game to be played (as respectably as may be) for his own advancement. Neither his character nor his abilities give him any *weight* with any class or party. Moreover, he is universally admitted to be destitute both of the statesmanlike capacity, the statesmanlike knowledge, and the statesmanlike sobriety and solidity of mind and morals. He belongs, not to the bees, but to the wasps and the butterflies of public life. He can sting and sparkle, but he cannot work. His place in the arena is marked and ticketed for ever.—Mr. Bright is a man of very vigorous though rough ability, his diligence is very meritorious, and he is gradually gaining the ear of the House; but his education is imperfect, his views narrow, his tone low, dogmatic, and somewhat vulgar; he has nothing of the statesman about him, and we do not imagine that he can ever soar above the position of a “Tribune of the People.” No one looks to him for a moment as a future minister.—Mr. Cobden’s mind is of a far higher order, his views more comprehensive, and his whole being and organization cast in a far finer mould; but his opinions and his language are too often extreme, and he has the great misfortune of being linked with a party altogether inferior to, and unworthy of himself; and it is to be feared that—

“He will lower to their level day by day,
What is fine within him growing coarse, to
sympathize with clay.”

Moreover, he also, like Mr. Bright, labours

under the almost insuperable defect of an incomplete early education. It is not that his knowledge is not far greater, and his comprehension of social questions often far juster, than those of many men who are useful and even eminent in official life; but he wants that indescribable enlargement and refinement of intellect, the faculty for understanding other minds, and appreciating hidden wants and sympathies, which is indispensable to those who would aspire to govern a nation of cultivated men, and which an early acquaintance with the more elegant and profound branches of learning can alone confer. A man who could say that a copy of “The Times” contained more wisdom and sound information than the whole of Thucydides, even were it but in a hasty explosion of spleen, must be wanting in some of the most essential endowments and sensibilities of a true statesman.—Sir William Molesworth and Mr. Roebuck are not open to this objection: they are both men of finished training as well as of popular sympathies, and perfectly capable of comprehending the acquirements of a country like ours, and of taking wide and ample views of the science of policy. But Sir William is rich and lazy—social rather than ambitious; and though commanding the confidence of the people, would, we suspect, prefer being “proximate” to being actual minister.—Mr. Roebuck’s valuable qualities are sadly clouded by certain constitutional defects. He is bold, honest, and courageous as few men are: but he is too apt to imagine that he has an absolute monopoly of these great gifts. He speaks truth both to constituents and to colleagues with an unflinching conscientiousness that is too seldom seen, but he takes care to put this truth in its most unpalatable and irritating form. He is far less extreme in his opinions than in his manner of stating them; and if he had added the *suaviter in modo* to the *fortiter in re*, he could scarcely fail to have been by this time far advanced on his way to high office. As it is, it seems to be generally admitted, even by those who think him one of the most talented politicians of the day—and we confess ourselves to be of this number—that his temper utterly precludes him from entering any ministry; since it is a temper which not only makes him unnecessarily and often unintentionally offensive to those with whom he comes in contact, but colours his whole views of men and things. He is a sort of radical Lord Grey; and it would, we imagine, be even less difficult to find a cabinet that would act with him, than a cabinet with which he would not consider it derogatory to act.

Let us now sum up the strength of our available and regular ministerial army, rank and file, on which the country will have to rely when the four worn and veteran statesmen whom we first named have retired or died. We have three cabinets to provide for—Tory, Liberal, and Medium. For the first we have literally no one: for the second we have Lords Clarendon, Granville, and Carlisle; with Mr. Fox Maule, Mr. Wilson, and Mr. Frederick Peel: for the third we have Lord Dalhousie, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Cardwell among the tried men; Mr. Sidney Herbert, the Duke of Newcastle, the Duke of Argyll, and possibly Lord Stanley among the prospective ones. The coalition of the whole set—proved men and hopeful men—could scarcely form one complete and competent ministry among them: and such a coalition we have not seen since the time of Pelham, and cannot look for in these more earnest and conscientious days. When Lord Derby has fallen a victim to the gout, Lord John Russell to feeble health, Lord Palmerston and Sir James Graham to the course of natural decay; when Sir George Grey has sunk under combined illness and toil, and Sir Francis Baring and Mr. Labouchere have yielded to their wish for ease and peace—*all of which events must happen soon, and may happen to-morrow*—we shall have to construct a ministry fit to govern and to guide our great empire out of the scanty materials we have enumerated. We must have a Premier, a Chancellor of the Exchequer, three Secretaries of State, a First Lord of the Admiralty, a Secretary or Lord Lieutenant for Ireland, and a President of the Board of Trade—*eight* in all, who must be men of superior and tried capacity and character, besides nine others of respectable ability; and we have, taking all parties together, only *six* adequate for chiefs, and about seven for secondary parts. Truly, our political army is in lamentable want of recruits.

To some parties, however, this state of affairs presents no cause for uneasiness. "In a country and an age so enlightened, so free, so self-governing as ours, we do not," they say, "need statesmen of lofty and surpassing genius to rule us. We can dispense with 'great men.'" There is some truth in this view; but it is partial and superficial truth. We can dispense with great men better than most nations, but we cannot dispense with them altogether, nor without mischief and without danger. Or rather, we can dispense with the *kind of greatness* which we do not require, but not with that kind which we do require. Ministers of vast philosophic capacity, like Ba-

con; of profound, systematic, thorough-going policy, like Strafford; of commanding and predominating genius, like Chatham; of imperious and overbearing resolve, like Pitt; or of haughty and unbending will, like the Duke of Wellington,—we perhaps do not need now. Their age is past. They would find no fitting scope, and no decorous place in our democratic and balanced constitution. Much of their superiority would be thrown away, and much of their power would be wasted in fruitless contest with the municipal and self-ruling element in our national character. Nor do we need as we once did—and valuable as such would still be—statesmen endowed with the special and glorious gift of legislative genius,—men who possess a penetrating and unerring insight into the character of the people, a thorough knowledge of their wants, and that peculiar organizing and arranging faculty, which can adapt laws and decrees to these two guiding conditions. The nation has now so many ways of explaining its own character, and proclaiming its own wants, that no one who can read and listen needs to misunderstand them, or remain ignorant of them; while at the same time it abounds in men of quick observation and of deep thought, whose united action in speech and writing even more than supplies the place, which, in less free or less developed countries, is filled by individual statesmen of paramount and commanding power. With us a hundred sensible and reflective men combine to do the work of one great man. Through the mighty, pervading, unresting engine of the press, they instruct, persuade, inoculate, and guide the people, as formerly and elsewhere a Clarendon, a Burleigh, a De Witt, a Hardenberg, or a Washington, might have done. More and more the policy of Britain is directed, its opinions formed, the tone of the national mind decided, its tendencies developed, its legislation modified, amended, and matured, by its writers rather than by its formal and official politicians. In matters of legislation, the unrecognised are often far more influential than the recognised statesmen of the day. In books and pamphlets, in newspapers and reviews, on a hundred noisy platforms, and in a thousand silent studies, the great national work is carried on; and carried on, in all likelihood, with a far greater aggregate of national benefit, if with less rapid and exact attainment of the immediate end, than if it were entrusted to a single statesman, towering far above the mass. Even in parliament, it is probable that sounder views are elicited, and more ultimate good effected by the crude and wild discussions and the bewildering and

shallow contributions of many men of imperfect knowledge and superficial understanding, than would be produced by the calm and elaborate exposition of one loftier mind. For the last half century the nation has done its own work. The union with Ireland was probably the last great act of individual legislative statesmanship. Catholic emancipation was extorted by the Irish people. Parliamentary reform was carried by the English people. The re-organization of the Poor-law was the work of men out of parliament and scarcely heard of at the time: they studied the subject, elaborated the plan, informed and prepared the country,—while ministers were scarcely persuaded to adopt so bold, masterly, and complete a measure. And the last great change in the spirit and direction of our policy—the adoption of Free Trade—was due to no section of statesmen, but solely to the middle classes and their self-elected leaders.

It is not, then, chiefly for the purpose of comprehensive and philosophic legislation that we require public men of superior and commanding ability, but for the purposes of government and administration. Incapacity in this department the floating talent and sense of the country cannot supplement, or can do so only imperfectly and at enormous cost. Incapacity in this department is productive of the most fruitful suffering and evil; it may continue to work its mischief for months and years before it is discovered and proclaimed; yet the press can do nothing but expose it, and Parliament can do nothing but discard the actual delinquents and replace them by others who may be no less incompetent. The functions and the powers of ministers, even in this country, where they are so constantly badgered and so closely watched, are vast and appalling. A thousand eyes are constantly observing them, a thousand tongues constantly calling them to account, with all the vigilance of mingled envy, animosity, and patriotism; yet how small a proportion of their daily actions ever come to light or become the subject of public animadversion! How still fewer are discovered, reprehended, and counteracted, before they have run a long course of misery and mischief! We imagine that a hostile and ambitious opposition affords us a sufficient guarantee against matters going much or long amiss. We are deplorably mistaken: it affords us, indeed, a security that ministers will act under a nervous sense of responsibility, and probably, therefore, with conscientiousness and caution; but it affords, and can afford, no security that they will act with judgment or discretion. Let us consider for a moment what

their functions are.* Each of them, in nine-tenths of the things which he has to do, is virtually absolute in his own department. A number of cases come before him daily in which he must act at once and upon his own judgment and responsibility. Most of these may be routine matters, or may appear unimportant; but each decision may carry with it fearful consequences. Parliament gives or refuses to each minister certain funds for special purposes, but there its action and control cease; the funds are spent as the minister thinks best. The Commander-in-Chief has the appointment of generals in various quarters: he may appoint a plausible fool or a superannuated friend, and the result is and has been sad reverses, fearful slaughter, perilous discomfiture. From indolence, prejudice, or incapacity, he may so mismanage the internal organization of the army, that when an emergency arises we have scarcely a regiment fit for efficient service; he may retain flint guns when every other nation has adopted percussion-caps; he may stick close to miserable muskets when everywhere else they have been superseded by improved rifles; he may allow our ordnance to fall so far behind the age as to become our own dread and our enemy's laughing-stock; he may dress our soldiers so that they cannot march, and mount our cavalry so that they cannot charge. All this has been done; much of it is said to be done now. Nay more, he not only may commit many of these errors, it is probable that he will. Inaction is always easier and often safer than

* "The far greater proportion of the duties which are performed in the office of a minister are and must be performed under no effective responsibility. Where politics and parties are not affected by the matter in question, and so long as there is no flagrant neglect or glaring injustice to individuals which a party can take hold of, the responsibility to Parliament is merely nominal, or falls otherwise only through casualty, caprice, and a misemployment of the time due from Parliament to legislative affairs. Thus the business of the office may be reduced within a very manageable compass, without creating public scandal. By evading decisions wherever they can be evaded; by shifting them on other departments or authorities, where by any possibility they can be shifted; by giving decisions upon superficial examinations, categorically, so as not to expose the superficiality by propounding the reasons; by deferring questions till, as Lord Bacon says, 'they resolve themselves;' by undertaking nothing for the public good which the public voice does not call for; by conciliating loud and energetic individuals at the expense of such public interests as are dumb, or do not attract attention; by sacrificing everywhere what is feeble and obscure to what is influential and cognizable; by such means and shifts as these the functionary may reduce his business within his powers, and perhaps obtain for himself the most valuable of all reputations in this line of life—that of being 'a safe man.'"—*The Statesman*, by Henry Taylor, p. 151.

activity; changes are troublesome, unwellcome and costly; and it requires some nerve to face a Parliamentary debate on an increased item in the estimates. Thus, without the public knowing, without Parliament vituperating, our army may fall into utter inefficiency, while appearances are well kept up; and the nation may be suddenly awakened from its apathy to trace, when it is too late, defeat and discredit to administrative incapacity, and to find itself called upon at a tremendous cost to redeem the consequences of having trusted a lazy or incompetent commander. It would be invidious to specify too closely; but recent history and present circumstances may supply to every one the needed commentary and confirmation.—Again, the first Lord of the Admiralty, and his chief Secretary, decide what stores shall be laid in, and how and whence: what ships shall be built and commissioned, how they shall be manned and armed, who shall command them, and where they shall be sent. If this is done, as we know it often is done, without discernment or discretion, consequences may ensue which it will require years of care and millions of money to obliterate. Not only may the public money be infamously and unavailingly squandered, but public servants may be drowned or poisoned by wholesale. An ill-appointed vessel, under an incompetent commander, may go down with a whole regiment of soldiers on board. A reckless or hot-headed captain, whose character the Admiralty ought to have known, may involve us in a dangerous quarrel—possibly in a costly war. Mismanagement or misplacement of our naval strength may expose our own shores to imminent and deadly risk, may compromise our long established maritime supremacy, and compel us to submit to insult which at the moment we are unprepared to resist. Hundreds of thousands of pounds, which might have commissioned a dozen ships, and raised the wages and satisfied the wishes of whole crews of deserving seamen, may be frittered away in building ships that will not sail, and then cutting them into two again; in constructing iron steamers which will not stand round shot, and are therefore wholly useless; or in making vessels too large for their engines, and ordering engines too heavy for the ships. Hundreds of thousands more may be wasted from the want of a simple system of checks and vouchers, such as every private establishment possesses, but such as Mr. Ward's celebrated circular betrayed the absence of in the navy. All this may be directly traceable to the negligence, ignorance, or incapacity of the prin-

cipal officials; yet the country may know nothing of it for years, and when informed of it, can do nothing but dismiss the offenders and appoint others who may be to the full as incapable. All this, too, our recent annals may amply illustrate.—The Colonial Secretary has, if possible, still greater power of irresponsible, unchecked, and undiscoverable mischief. He governs, nearly automatically, forty dependencies, some of them larger than the mother-country, whose dearest interests he may irreparably damage, whose safety he may jeopardize, and whose affections he may alienate by an injudicious despatch, a careless decision, or a bad appointment. He may destroy the property of hundreds, he may undermine the commerce of a district, he may produce or prolong wars of the most irritating and unprofitable kind, as in New Zealand and at the Cape; he may act over again on a small scale, the complicated blunders and sad catastrophes of 1776; and the country which he is ruining can neither detect nor control him. His power of mischief is almost equal to that of the father of evil. All this, again, the annals of Canada, Australasia, and Jamaica, shew to be no mere, no speculative possibility, but in some degree, in some form, in some quarter, a matter of yearly occurrence.—The same remarks will apply with almost equal force to the Governor-General of India, on whose judgment the most momentous questions as to war and peace in our Eastern empire almost hourly depend. How much depends on the soundness of this judgment, let Burmah, Scinde, Cabul, and the Punjab, testify.—At home, indeed, we can watch the Home Secretary more closely, and check him somewhat more promptly, yet, in nearly everything that relates to the administration of justice and the disposal of criminals, what a mass of vital arrangements depends upon his secret and absolute fiat! What shall be done with condemned offenders; whether and whither they shall be transported, or in what hulks they shall be confined; what system of prison discipline shall be adopted, and to whom the carrying out of experiments on which so much depends shall be confided; what criminals shall be left for execution, and whose sentences shall be remitted or commuted;—all these things are decided, not by Parliament, nor by the country, but by one man and his subordinates, who act as they think proper, and whose capacity and wisdom are therefore questions of national importance, second certainly to none.—And, to conclude, what fearful contingencies often hang upon the right or wrong decision, the tact, the for-

bearance, the firmness, the temper, the discretion of the Foreign Secretary, whose line of conduct is fixed upon in the secrecy of his own cabinet, and whose proceedings are seldom known to the country till many months after they have been in operation, and till their results, however mischievous, have long been wholly irremediable. A European war—the extent, the termination, and the significance of which no prophet can foresee—may depend, and has ere now depended, on the conduct, temper, and opinions of one single man whom we place at the head of this particular department. And shall we be satisfied to have only a few mediocre and untried men to select him from?

When such are the tremendous—and though not irresponsible yet certainly uncontrolled—powers which we place in the hands of those who administer our national affairs, when every decision which they take involves the welfare and happiness of thousands, when the country may be called upon to expiate, with its dearest lives and its richest treasure, every blunder they may commit through imperfect knowledge, or inadequate capacity, who shall say that we do not require in our public men the most commanding ability—powers the most special and the most rare? The magnitude of the interests at stake cannot be exaggerated; the talents required for the task can scarcely be estimated by too high a standard. The wellbeing of a nation, and of that portion of human progress which it influences and decides, has to be provided for. How cautious, and how deliberately tested ought to be the choice of those to whom it is confided;—how rich, numerous, varied, and select, should be the list of candidates out of whom our election must be made! These considerations may lead us to perceive the dangers which threaten us from the paucity and poverty of administrative materials which we have explained above: it remains to inquire into a few of the causes whence this poverty has arisen, and into the quarter in which a remedy for it is to be sought.

It is customary to attribute this scanty supply of public men in a great measure to the aristocratic exclusiveness of the two great parties which have hitherto divided the power and management of the State between them. The Whigs, in particular, it is alleged, have always been notorious for unwillingness to admit to a real *bonâ fide* participation in either the honours or emoluments of office any but those who were connected with their chiefs by family ties, or who had the privilege of moving in their

polished and fastidious circles. They have shrunk still more than the Tories from genuine and liberal alliances with men of no family or rank, even when these men had rendered them the most signal aid in their political contests, and were far superior to themselves in administrative and parliamentary ability. They have always been noted for breeding in and in; and the usual consequences of such exclusiveness have followed. Even Burke, it is remembered, the great political philosopher of his day, and long the ornament and the strength of the Whig party—a man whose name will live in reverence when all his colleagues and contemporaries are forgotten—was never admitted to a seat in the cabinet, but, when his party came into power, was unworthily delegated to one of those offices of secondary influence and emolument reserved for able and indispensable, but untitled allies. Since that time, Poulett Thomson and Huskisson are, we believe, the only unconnected plebeians (out of the legal profession) who have ever attained the dignity of cabinet ministers among the Whigs; and the first of these reached that post only by slow degrees, and through the personal friendship of a simple-minded and honourable man, (Lord Althorp,) and held it only for a short period. Whenever a popular leader has attained such eminence in Parliament that he cannot safely or decently be passed over, it has been customary to offer him some minor post, the acceptance of which, though it might ultimately lead to further advancement, would impose upon its holder the duty of defending the measures of his principals, and sharing in the disgrace attached to their impropriety, clumsiness, or failure, without conferring upon him the smallest share in the previous discussion or concoction of them. Such posts are very properly offered to *rising* men of promise; but on such they are rarely bestowed by the Whigs. Such posts can scarcely be proposed to men whose character is high, whose position is made, whose talents have already won for them wide influence and independent power, without something approaching to insult. Mr. Cobden, for example, was perhaps too young and too inexperienced, in 1846, for an office of first-rate dignity and power, though fifteen years older than Mr. Pitt when he was Prime Minister, and than Mr. Peel when Secretary for Ireland;—yet how would it have been dignified or decent for him, with his position as a party leader, his vast influence in the country, and a high character to lose or to confirm, to have accepted the offered vice-presidency of the Board of Trade, with no seat in the cabinet, and conse-

quently with no control over the proceedings of a ministry who might drag him through any dirt and cover him with any obloquy? Till our great political chiefs recognise and bend to the necessity of enlisting in their service, on honourable and generous terms, and thus training in time for future eminence, all rising politicians, of whatever rank, who display promising capacity—till they can stoop to renew their worn-out blood from that middle class which is so rich in strong and practical ability—our supply of statesmen can scarcely be otherwise than scanty.

There is considerable truth in this complaint, though, perhaps, something exaggerated. It is certainly much to be desired, that the ministers who are to rule the country should be chosen from as wide a basis as possible, and that neither wealth, rank, nor connexions, should be regarded as indispensable pre-requisites for high office—wherever middle-class men have in them the materials of statesmen they should be appointed as freely as any others. But does the fault lie altogether with those who have the disposal of official places? Have the middle classes sent up to Parliament men trained and qualified for statesmanship? Have the sober wisdom, the cautious views, the comprehensive knowledge, the wide and liberal instruction, the capacity for seeing all sides of a question, and for looking beyond superficial appearances and immediate and transitory consequences—have these, the peculiar qualities which mark a man out as fit for office, been also the qualities specially sought for by the middle classes, and peculiarly honoured in their representatives?—Have not, on the contrary, the shallow, the noisy, the violent, the flashy, the men of narrow vision and imperfect education, the men who echoed, rather than the men who opposed, the passions and prejudices of the place and hour, been chosen by preference for Parliament? How many members have been sent up by the middle classes, from among their own ranks, out of whom statesmen could be made—to whom ministers, without rashness, and without guilt, could intrust the headship of any department? Is it the “stump-orator” from the Tower Hamlets? Is it the medical, or the fashionable, member for Finsbury? Is it the gentleman who sits for Bolton, so modest, and so highly educated? Or the gentleman who sits for Ashton, so renowned for his sincerity? Is it the dethroned Railway King who represents Sunderland? Or the golden calf who represents one of the Newcastles? Is it the apostle of temperance who sits for Derby? or the honourable member for Montrose, to whom

age has brought no experience and little enlightenment? We might go on through a long list; but it is needless, and would sound invidious. It would be difficult to name a single man of the middle class in Parliament who has displayed any superior ability, and who is not either in office, or by some peculiarity or defect, obviously unfitted for it. Mr. Shiel, Mr. Wyse, Mr. Ward, were all in office, till they accepted diplomatic posts. Mr. Hawes was in office till, after repeated failures, he sank in despair upon his present feather bed. Mr. Baines and Mr. Strutt have been in office, and will be, we trust, again. And Charles Buller, an abler man than any, would probably have risen to high position but for his premature death. Mr. Wilson is in office, or has lately been; who will say, that Mr. Bright, Mr. Cobden, or Mr. Roebuck, ought to be? In the present state of affairs, we do not believe, that if the constituencies will send up middle-class men qualified for office, there is much fear of their being passed over. There may, indeed, be a lingering indisposition to appoint them to the highest posts; but to these they must fight their way by convincing *the country* of their pre-eminent qualifications. England will not see her destinies intrusted to a second-rate nobleman, while a commoner of unquestionable superiority and fitness stands beside him ready for the task. But the mistake seems to be, to assume that popular leaders and skilful orators have necessarily any statesmanlike qualities or capacities about them. Probably in five cases out of six their appointment would be scarcely more fatal to the country than to their own fame.

A more really operative cause of the phenomenon we are deploring, may be found in the gradually increasing tendency among our ablest and most fitting men to retire from Parliament, and shrink from public life. Many causes contribute to strengthen and to spread this tendency. In the first place, Parliament is no longer as comfortable or desirable a place as formerly. The work is far harder, the dignity far less, the collateral and sinister advantages far fewer and more uncertain than they used to be. The labour imposed upon those members who really endeavour to do their duty to their constituencies and their country—and no others can long retain their seats—is so severe, that only the strongest frames can bear it, and only the most obstinate ambition will encounter it. Our Senators have to work as hard as the followers of some of the most highly paid professions; and they reap no emolument, little fame, and few thanks. They have to stay in town all sum-

mer, and to sit up nearly all night. They have often to put a strong control on their own feelings, and severe restrictions on their own tastes. They have to be considerate and courteous to all their constituents, to endure the caprices of the fretful, the complaints of the captious, the exactions of the unreasonable, and often the insults of the vulgar. The title of M.P. used to be a diploma of distinction: it is now too frequently only the badge and livery of servitude. Formerly, it meant access into the best society, a share in the deepest national interests, admission behind the scenes of the most exciting drama. Now, it signifies, for the vast majority of those who hold it, nothing but enrolment in a miscellaneous herd of over-worked and unremunerated drudges. Formerly, too, a seat in Parliament often gave a man the means of providing for himself, generally of providing for his friends: now, happily and righteously, these ignominious and underhand perquisites are nearly all swept away. What wonder then that the quiet, the unambitious, the self-respecting—those who, undazzled by the hollow splendour, and undeceived by youthful dreams, can calmly measure the object against the price, the gain against the sacrifice—should incline to keep out of an arena where so much is to be endured, and, unless for the exceptional few, so little to be achieved! What wonder that one, eminent alike in literature and in Parliament, should write thus of the latter life:—"There is little reason, in our opinion, to envy those who are still engaged in a pursuit from which, at most, they can only hope that, by relinquishing liberal studies and social pleasures, by passing nights without sleep, and summers without one glimpse of the beauties of nature, they may attain that laborious, that invidious, that closely watched slavery, which is mocked with the name of power."

There is another reason, less selfish and more creditable, which induces many men peculiarly qualified to influence, to guide and to instruct the country, to retire from public life and seek out other channels of patriotic usefulness. Parliament is no longer the sole, nor the chief arena in which public service can be rendered. Formerly, Parliament was the only place in which the national work was done; a warning voice, if raised anywhere else, was like that of one crying in the wilderness; wisdom and information, speaking elsewhere than at St. Stephen's, spoke without an audience or an echo. It was there that public grievances were made known; it was there that freedom and justice were defended; it was there that public delinquents were brought to public trial and

to public shame; it was there that sound views of policy were argued and inculcated, and sound principles of morality disseminated through the national mind. Parliament was not only the great guardian, but the great educator of the people. Now, the Press has superseded many of the functions of Parliament, and performs them far more ceaselessly and efficiently than Parliament could do. It ferrets out abuses, exposes jobs, and detects secret iniquities and negligences, and strips naked hypocrisies and shams. It represents grievances, denounces oppressions, diffuses information, examines doctrines, and inoculates the country with them. Public meetings too, associations and organizations out of doors, do much to prepare, to instruct, and to inform. In every town, and every circle of society, men who in Parliament would be dumb and powerless, are actively at work in forming and spreading their own opinions. It has become easier to act upon Parliament through the nation, than upon the nation through the Parliament. Hence it has begun to be generally felt, that unless a man be endowed with some rare and special faculties, of which oratory is the first, and a peculiar social tact the second, he will be actually more influential out of Parliament than in it. Those who have had an opportunity of tracing back public movements to their origin, are well aware how many of the most important of them are due to men of whom the world never hears, but yet gifted with great ability, and that peculiar ability most adapted for the public service,—who study in quiet and in patience the great social questions of the day, form their views upon them, and then, either by writing or conversation, contrive to indoctrinate others with them; while ostensible Members of Parliament become the unconscious instruments and mouthpieces of these silent and obscure politicians. Both in the higher and the middle ranks may be found numbers scattered through the land, whose minds are incessantly occupied with public interests, whose views are far profounder, whose knowledge of affairs is greater, whose mastery of subjects is more complete, and whose actual influence on the world's march is more real and more powerful, than is ever attained by those who are prominent before the country, and who are its nominal rulers and administrators.

But not only are the best men often unwilling to go to Parliament—the constituencies are often unwilling to send them there. Those who would make the best legislators and administrators are not always adapted to the tastes or malleable to the purposes of

the mass of electors. The qualities which are popular on the hustings are by no means always the qualities which are suited to serve the country in a public capacity, and large constituencies have rarely the judgment to discern what these qualities are, or the patriotism to choose them, when accompanied by cold manners, offensive candour, independent feelings, or unbending tenacity of opinion. Every general election affords instances enough to corroborate our statement. Mr. S. J. Loyd, now Lord Overstone, a man of singular soundness and clearness of view, better acquainted with commercial and financial matters than probably any man living, but too indolent and refining to be easily persuadable to enter on the public arena, was rejected by Manchester. Mr. Macaulay, notwithstanding his unquestioned ability and eloquence, was rejected by Edinburgh; and being unable to find another borough, resigned his seat in the Cabinet, and retired to the fame and comfort of a literary life. Lord Morpeth, the most estimable and the most beloved of public men, was defeated in Yorkshire, and was out of Parliament for several Sessions;—and Sir James Graham, whom all allow to be the ablest administrator now living, has never sat twice in succession for the same borough, and it is believed was recently prevented from taking office because he dared not risk the chances of a new election.

But the principal cause of the evil we are considering—the adequate supply of public servants of commanding talent—lies deeper still, and is inherent in the very constitution of a Parliamentary government such as ours. The more the country needs capable administrators, and the less it needs orators and legislators, the more the evil will become apparent, and the more defective will our system be found. By an ancient and nearly invariable custom our ministers are selected exclusively out of our Parliamentary notabilities. Yet it is undeniable that the qualities which make men formidable leaders, which render them eminent and powerful in Parliament, are very different from those which are required for the efficient and judicious management of government departments. The talking and the acting faculties; the power of doing things well, and the power of defending them skilfully; the talent for “dressing up a statement for the House,” and the talent for finding the policy fitted for an Empire; administrative genius and dialectic skill, seldom meet in one mind; and, indeed, belong to wholly distinct classes of intellectual superiority. A Chancellor of the Exchequer may be noted for his thorough mastery of financial science, yet be wholly

deficient in the power of addressing a critical audience or of making out a good case for his measures. Or like a recent appointment, he may be a brilliant rhetorician, yet an absolute ignoramus in matters of commerce or taxation. He may delight the House of Commons, but terrify Lombard Street. The Members of Parliament may flock down from Bellamy’s as soon as they know that he is on his legs; while the members of the Stock Exchange grow pale when they read of his appointment. The Colonial Secretary, too, may rule distant dependencies with the genius of Wellington or Richelieu, yet be unable to speak two consecutive sentences in the House, without a solecism or a blunder. Yet our system passes by the solid governor, and selects the brilliant haranguer.

“Under the Tudors and the early Stuarts, (writes Mr. Macaulay in his review of Sir W. Temple), it was generally by courtly arts, or by official skill or knowledge, that a politician raised himself to power. From the time of Charles II., down to our own days, a different species of talent, parliamentary talent, has been the most valuable of all the qualifications of an English statesman. It has stood in the place of all other acquirements. It has covered ignorance, weakness, rashness, the most fatal mal-administration. A great negotiator is nothing compared with a great debater; and a minister who can make a successful speech need trouble himself little about an unsuccessful expedition. This is the talent which has made judges without law, and diplomatists without French; which has sent to the Admiralty men who did not know the stern of a ship from the bowsprit, and to the India Board men who did not know the difference between a rupee and a pagoda; which made a foreign secretary of Mr. Pitt, who, as George II. said, had never opened Vattel, and which was very near making a Chancellor of the Exchequer of Mr. Sheridan, who could not work a sum in long division.”

Now, this is a prolific source of mischief, which, as long as Parliament confined itself to its original functions, was comparatively little felt, but which now, in the course of time and through the operation of certain gradual and insensible changes, has become increasingly serious and manifest. While Parliament was a body of notables assembled for purposes of deliberation and discussion, for voting or refusing taxes, for representing national feelings and proclaiming national grievances, the talent of ready speech, clear statement, skilful dialectic, and vehement denunciation, found their proper vocation, and did good service. But when, in process of time, Parliament took upon itself the task of close supervision and control, and of direct and often minute interfer-

once with the executive, when it became virtually a *governing* as well as a legislating and representing body, very different endowments were needed in its members; and its fitness for its new and self-imposed duties became yearly more questionable. Its constitution is much what it used to be, but its functions are materially altered. As the House of Commons has become more popular and more of a debating club, it has also assumed more and more of the labours which popular debating clubs are singularly unsuited to perform. It was admirably adapted for its ancient and original purpose—not at all so for its modern and superinduced one. It was originally a *checking*, not an *acting* body—an assembly for securing the subject against the oppression and encroachment of the Crown. In this, its native and intentional function, it is inimitable and unrivalled; for its subsequent and adopted one, it is at best but a clumsy contrivance. It is excellent as a defender of our liberties and an exponent of our wishes and our wants; but for *governing*, or for preventing misgovernment, it is tedious, ponderous, and inefficient.

“What I had to remark,” observes Mr. Carlyle, “of this long Parliament, and of its English predecessors generally, from the times of Rufus downwards, is this perfect veracity of purpose, this exact adaptation to getting the business done that was in hand. Supplies did in some way use to be granted; grievances, such as never fail, did in some way use to be stated and redressed. The silent peoples had their *Parliamentum*, and spake by it to their kings who governed them. In all human government, wherever a man will attempt to govern men, this is a function as necessary as the breath of life; and it must be said the old European populations, and the fortunate English best of all, did this function *well*. The old Parliaments were authentic entities; came upon indispensable work, and were in earnest to their very finger-ends about getting it done. . . . Parliament now, if we examine well, has irrevocably lost certain of its old functions, which it still pretends to do; and has got certain new functions, which it never can do, and yet pretends to be doing,—a doubly fatal predicament. Its functions growing ever more confused in this twofold way, the position of Parliament has become a false, and is gradually becoming an impossible one, in modern affairs. It has had to prevent and distort its poor activity in all manner of ways, and at length has diffused itself in oceans of windy talk, reported in *Hansard*; has grown, in short, a national palaver, and is, as I said lately, one of the strangest entities this sun ever looked down upon. For, I think, a national palaver, recognised as Sovereign, a solemn convocation of all the stump-orators in the nation to come and govern us, was not seen on the earth till recently. . . . A Parliament, especially a Parliament with newspaper reporters firmly es-

tablished in it, is an entity which by its very nature cannot do work, but can do talk only—which at times may be needed, and at other times may be very needless. Consider, in fact, a body of six hundred and fifty-eight miscellaneous persons set to consult about ‘business,’ with twenty-seven millions, mostly fools, assiduously listening to them;—was there ever since the world began—will there ever be till the world end, any ‘business’ accomplished in these circumstances? We may take it as a fact, and should lay it to heart everywhere, that no Sovereign ruler with six hundred and fifty-eight heads, set to rule twenty-seven millions, by continually talking in the hearing of them all, can for the life of it make a good figure in that vocation.”

Every page of our recent history abounds with proofs and examples of the mischiefs and abuses which arise from our inveterate and probably now inevitable habit of arranging all measures and making all appointments with a view to parliamentary considerations. Measures are concocted, not because they are the best adapted to the wants of the country, but because they are the most likely to be easily passed by the Commons, and growlingly sanctioned by the Lords. Men are selected for this or that influential and responsible office, not on account of any remarkable fitness for the discharge of its functions, which has been exhibited by them, or is supposed to lie hidden within them, but because parliamentary support may be conciliated, or parliamentary hostility disarmed, by their appointment. The interests of the country are sacrificed, that the government of the country may be carried on. A commercial minister may be a mere tyro in finance; but the trade of the country must be fettered and endangered by giving him power to carry out his unwise conceptions, that the votes of himself and his supporters may be secured. An incapable nobleman is made Secretary-at-War, and allowed by his mismanagement to sacrifice regiment after regiment, and hazard campaign after campaign, as in the late war, because the Cabinet cannot dispense with his brilliant debating powers in the House of Commons. Thousands of valuable lives and millions of valuable treasure are wasted—as at Walcheren—in a fruitless and wretchedly managed expedition, because the Premier chooses to place his own brother at its head, and the Premier is omnipotent in Parliament. An indolent, obscure, or superannuated admiral is placed in command of an important squadron, and golden opportunities are lost in senseless evolutions, because the admiral has a host of parliamentary friends, whom it would be dangerous for the Ministry to offend. Similar solecisms are committed daily, but it is only in the criti-

cal exigencies of war, or when in peace some unforeseen emergency occurs, calling for qualities in appointed servants which they do not possess, that their full consequences come to light. We need go no farther back than the Peninsular campaigns for abundant examples. Mr. Canning was, at that time, Foreign Minister, and Mr. Perceval, Premier. The latter was a man of the scantiest ability, but had the confidence of the Crown, and possessed enormous weight in the House of Commons. The former was a statesman of most brilliant genius, and a skilful and vigorous diplomatist, but wholly destitute of the administrative capacity and diligence to conduct the complicated arrangements of a continental war. He was, however, the great stay of the Ministry in debate, and could not be spared. Lord Castlereagh, a nobleman of high honour, and of great parliamentary experience and skill, but of very small natural capacity, was Secretary-at-War. Accordingly, never was the blood and treasure of a country so vexatiously and lamentably wasted as those of England were by these three incapables. Their blunders were scarcely credible, and can only be fairly understood after careful study of Colonel Napier's History. Mr. Canning scattered his agents over Spain, chose them ill, made them independent of each other, allowed and encouraged them to lavish money, arms, and stores, on the wretched and ungrateful Spanish generals, hampered his own noble and consummate commander, Sir John Moore, with senseless instructions, turned a deaf ear to his remonstrances and demands, and, when he failed and fell, threw upon him the whole blame of the discomfiture which he himself had prepared. During the long and arduous years in which the Duke of Wellington, with unrivalled and profound strategy, and even statesmanship, fought his way from Lisbon to Bayonne, his own government was his worst enemy, his most formidable and hopeless antagonist. In spite of repeated representations, his troops were left without stores, without shoes, without clothes, without ammunition. The engineering tools sent out were so bad that our engineers were dependent on those captured from the French. Besieging batteries, constantly demanded, were either refused or delayed, till the Duke was repeatedly compelled to carry fortresses by assault, which were only half breached, against all the rules of military science, and at a cost of life which was absolutely appalling. The military chest was constantly empty, and the most important enterprises were in consequence obliged to be abandoned. Re-in-

forcements both of men and money, which were lavished on the incapable Lord Chat-ham, were denied to the energetic and successful Sir Arthur Wellesley. Officers of high rank neglected or disobeyed his orders, and thus sacrificed his soldiers, endangered his victories, or made them fruitless; yet he dared not punish or cashier them, because the parliamentary influence of their families forbade. Throughout the whole campaign the genius of the Duke had to remedy, and the blood of the soldiers to atone for, the blunders and culpable negligence of Mr. Perceval, Mr. Canning, and Lord Castlereagh. The fate of thousands of brave and valuable men lies at the door of those three ministers, and of the system which made such men so powerful as they were.

To the same system—the system which places at the head of affairs men of parliamentary influence and parliamentary talent, but of no other qualifications for administration or command—may be traced, more or less directly, most of our recent disasters:—the Affghanistan war, with its train of discomfiture and disgrace; the escapades of Lord Ellenborough, whom happily even parliamentary influence could not save from being recalled; the unhappy mess which Governor Fitzroy brought about in New Zealand; the Canadian rebellion; and the Caffre wars. Everywhere the same story. In war, in commerce, in administration, the governed have had to supplement the deficiencies, correct the faults, support the weight, and pay for the blunders of the governors. Everywhere the sense and bottom of the English people and the English soldiers have been called upon to counteract the incapacity or folly of English rulers. In this lies the explanation of what otherwise might well perplex us,—how is it, namely, that such a system has endured so long, and produced so much less mischief than it seemed calculated to engender. The people, as a whole, are supplying a constant and often unconscious corrective.

"An English seventy-four," (says Mr. Carlyle,) "if you look merely at the articulate law and methods of it, is one of the impossiblest entities. The captain is appointed not by pre-eminent merit in sailanship, but by parliamentary connexion; the men are got by impressment; a press-gang goes out, knocks men down in the streets of seaports, and drags them on board,—if the ship were to be stranded, I have heard that they would nearly all run ashore and desert. Can anything be more unreasonable than a seventy-four? Articulate, almost nothing. But it has inarticulate traditions, ancient methods, and habitudes in it, stoicisms, nobleness, true rules both of sailing and of conduct; enough to keep it afloat on Nature's veridical bosom after all. See; if you bid

it sail to the end of the world, it will lift anchor, go, and arrive. The raging oceans do not beat it back; it, too, as well as the raging oceans, has a relation to Nature, and it does not sink, but under due conditions is borne along. If it meet with hurricanes, it rides them out; if it meet an enemy's ship, it shivers it to powder; and in short it holds on its way, and to a wonderful extent does what it means and pretends to do. Assure yourself, my friend, there is an immense fund of truth somewhere or other stowed in that seventy-four."

All who have had much to do with Ministers, and Members of Parliament, and those who come into constant social or official contact with them, seldom fail to become conscious of a certain marked and specific character which pervades the whole *genus*. Originally, they may be cast in Nature's most discrepant moulds. They may be conservative and antique by temper and tradition. They may be liberal and profuse in their sentiments. They may be aggressively benevolent, or carelessly epicurean. They may be fond of labour, or they may be fond of ease. They may call themselves aristocratic, or may flatter themselves that they are popular. But the same easily recognisable stamp of family likeness is upon them all. They are all *parliament men*—and no mistake. They have all been stretched on the same Procrustean bed, fused in the same crucible, subjected to the same annealing process. Their native dissimilarities are not, indeed, crushed out of them, but are all harmonized and overpowered by the pressure of one pervading and controlling element. They take different sides of a question, but they think in the same conventional style. They draw their information from the same *set* of organs, and look at the world through spectacles, different, indeed, in power and colour, but all proceeding from the same workshop. They are all conversant with, and insensibly moulded by the gossip of the clubs; they all think much of the Edinburgh and Quarterly Reviews; they all listen anxiously to the language of *The Times*, and are not wholly without concern about the articles in the Morning Chronicle, the Morning Post, and the Daily News. But beyond these they seldom go. Opinions which find expression in none of these party and London organs they despise or ignore. *De non apparentibus et non existentibus eadem est ratio*. The North British, the British Quarterly, the Westminster Review, the Leeds Mercury, the Manchester Guardian, wide as their circulation, and great as their influence is among the miscellaneous and the middle classes, they seldom read, and regard little. Sentiments may be fermenting, and doctrines may be spreading

for years, in the interior of the community, till they have modified the whole bent and character of the nation, and yet these men may have heard nothing of them, till some such startling facts as the Birmingham Political Union, the Anti-Corn-Law League, or the Secession of the Free Church, break in upon their apathetic slumbers, and enlarge the narrow and artificial boundaries of their knowledge. In spite of warning voices occasionally raised within their hearing, these denizens of the conventional political world of London and St. Stephens remain wholly ignorant alike of the power, the feelings, and the intellect of the silent middle ranks; and would be amazed and somewhat alarmed if they could know the contempt and disgust which these often feel for the party manoeuvres which occupy them, the trifles which absorb them, the blunders which disgrace them, and the infatuation which blinds them. The Parliament, reformed as it is—further reformed as it may be—must enlarge its channels of information; the officials—improved in this respect though they are—must widen their basis, and open their sympathies far more than they have yet done, before they can know what the country expects from them, and can furnish them with the means of effecting.

There are sundry little customs which have, by the lapse of time, attained almost the rigidity of law, by which we contrive still further to aggravate the difficulty of finding and securing the ablest and fittest men for the public service. Some of these have grown up gradually and insensibly, and have descended to us from remote times; others have been adopted to guard against dangers which were real and imminent once, but which have long since passed away. Two, especially, require a passing notice, as they are almost yearly operating to our disadvantage, and not seldom to our actual suffering and danger. The first of these is the union in the person of the Lord Chancellor of the two functions of Keeper of the Great Seal, and Chief Judge in Equity. In the first quality, he is the principal adviser of the Sovereign, keeper of the royal conscience, patron of the church livings of the Crown, appointer of justices of the peace, &c., superintendent-general of charities, guardian, in the king's name, of infants, idiots, and lunatics. In virtue of these functions, he is essentially a political officer, and as such, forms a part of the cabinet, and, rightly and necessarily, stands or falls with his ministerial colleagues. But, in his second capacity, he is the supreme judge in the most difficult, complicated, and laborious court of justice in the kingdom, exercising the most awfully arbitrary and

extensive jurisdiction, discharging functions of which only the most exclusive attention, the most unremitting assiduity, the most continuous watchfulness, can approximate to an adequate performance. To enable him to do anything like justice to the hard duties thrust upon him, and to the numberless suitors, whose property, happiness, liberty, and sometimes life, are at his disposal, it would be necessary, not only that he should have nothing else to do, but that he should be permanent and irremovable, and that he should be appointed with a *sole* regard to his judicial capacity and his experience in equity practice. Yet, in contempt and seeming defiance of these obvious and universally admitted considerations, the two offices continue to be united in one person, to the unspeakable injury of both departments, one of which is continually sacrificed to the other. The consequences of this utterly indefensible arrangement are, *first*, That the ablest lawyers are at times unwilling to accept an office which, while it removes them from their former sphere of usefulness and emoluments, they may, perhaps, hold only for a few months, and then be subjected to eternal idleness and obscurity;—*secondly*, That causes in equity are often heard and reheard before four or five different chancellors, each of which comes new and unprepared to the hearing; that as soon as a judge becomes experienced and competent, the chances are, that he is removed to make way for a successor, who has his business to learn at the expense of the unhappy litigants who come before him; and that the work, being more than any one man can possibly get through, accumulates and complicates, till the Court of Chancery has become an instrument of injustice, cruelty, and oppression, such as the Inquisition can only faintly imitate, and such as no European country, except England, can produce or could tolerate;—and, *thirdly*, That lord chancellors are constantly appointed, who either are of no value to their colleagues or their country, as political advisers, or who, being chosen for their oratorical powers, or their parliamentary influence, are wholly unfit to preside over a court, requiring for its due conduct the rarest and loftiest legal qualifications. Cabinets generally choose the latter alternative, as the least evil to themselves, though immeasurably the greatest to the nation. Instances are not wanting. In the early part of the century, Lord Erskine was made chancellor, because he was a popular pleader, an eloquent speaker, and an ardent Whig, though he knew little of law, and was wholly ignorant of equity. In 1830, the same motives promoted Mr. Brougham to the Woolsack, much

against his own will, it is said, although, while respectable as a common lawyer, he was utterly inexperienced in equity. Lord Cottenham, who made an excellent Chancery judge, was quite valueless as a political functionary;—while his successor, again, a competent chief justice, but an inexperienced and incompetent chancellor, owed his appointment entirely to political considerations. An anomaly productive of so much oppression and misery, and admitting of no defence, will surely not be endured much longer.

The custom of requiring every Member of Parliament, who accepts Ministerial office, to vacate his seat and submit himself to his constituents for re-election or rejection, is a fertile source of embarrassment and mischief. At one time, undoubtedly, it was a wise and salutary precaution against the selection and retention by the Crown of ministers who did not possess the confidence of the nation. It served, or might serve, to prevent the monarch from employing a commoner, at least, who was supposed to entertain designs against the liberties of the people. Now this danger no longer exists, and the precaution against it should cease likewise. No statesman condemned by or unpopular with the House of Commons can now retain office a single day. The custom, moreover, is we think indefensible on the broad constitutional grounds of justice. It enables not the nation, *but any one constituency*, to put a negative upon the indubitable right of the sovereign to choose his own servants. It enables any one constituency—and that perhaps the smallest, most ignorant, and most corrupt in the community—to dismiss or forbid the choice of a minister who may possess the confidence and admiration both of the monarch and the parliament. Before the Reform Bill, this evil and incongruity was not felt, because the nomination boroughs offered an easy mode of nullifying it. If a new minister was rejected by his former constituents, he was immediately elected for some Government seat, which a subordinate vacated to make room for him, or a place was purchased for him by the outlay of £3000 or £4000 of his own or government money. Now, however, these arrangements are not so easy, and are not always practicable, and great inconvenience frequently arises in consequence. On one occasion Lord John Russell was out of parliament for some weeks during the middle of session, to the great detriment of the public business, till the member for Stroud vacated on his behalf. Sir James Graham is the ablest administrator among our living statesmen, and is the man of all others, whom a

large portion of the educated classes of the community would most desire to see in power. But something in his manners, or something which perhaps we must designate as a certain want of nobleness and generosity of temper, makes him so personally unpopular, that, as we have already observed, he has scarcely ever sat twice for the same constituency, and if now appointed to office, might very possibly be returned by none. Indeed, if there be any truth in the rumour, that at the close of last year the negotiations which Lord John Russell is known to have opened with Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Cardwell, were rendered abortive because none of these gentlemen felt any confidence in their re-election, we may now trace the advent of a Tory Ministry of unparalleled and dangerous incapacity, the risk arising from an interregnum and a general election at a crisis of great external confusion and uncertainty, and the nuisance of having to fight the battle of free-trade over again, to the operation of this absurd and antiquated custom. A long-established government has been upset, and has been obliged to resign its functions at a most critical moment into most alarming hands, because three constituencies—one insignificant, one notoriously bigoted, and a third notoriously corrupt—forbade it to call to its aid and that of the country three men of tried and eminent ability.

To point out existing evils is a far easier and less delicate task than to suggest a remedy. We well know how slowly and reluctantly the English mind admits a new idea, and with what distrust and distaste the public always turns from any recommendations which have the least air of science or system about them. Any attempt to modify or counteract the actual present tendencies of the nation—any scheme of amendment or of safety, however cautious, moderate, and wise, which cannot be introduced to public attention under the ægis of a precedent—is almost certain to be suspiciously and ill received. Thousands who have gone along with us in our statement of the difficulties under which we labour, and of the dangers which threaten us from a defective supply of able public servants, and from the inherent unsuitability of the source from which they are chosen to supply precisely the *right sort* of men—will turn away prepossessed or hopeless, when we endeavour to point out the direction in which an alleviation of these difficulties and a guarantee against these dangers should be sought. Nevertheless we shall venture on a few suggestions, which, when they have lain long

enough and been re-produced often enough before the public mind for their novelty to have worn off, may possibly meet with a dispassionate consideration.

In the first place, it would seem desirable that the House of Commons should if possible be restored to its original functions of an advising, representing, and controlling, but not governing body. This looks like a hopeless recommendation, and perhaps it is so. It is, as both our own history and the contemporary annals of continental nations show, an inherent tendency in popular legislative assemblies, to encroach on the department of the executive, and gradually to draw to themselves all the powers of the state. We have sinned less than our continental neighbours in this respect, it is true, and perhaps their example may supply us with a timely warning; but for many years, and especially since 1832, our movement has been undeniably in this direction. And for a powerful body, voluntarily and from a sense of public benefit, to divest itself of functions and influence which it has usurped, would be an unheard of forbearance. Still something may be done by making the public mind aware of the tendency, and convincing it that the tendency is ruinous. Now it is abundantly obvious, *first*, that actual *business* can never be efficiently or promptly done by a committee or board of 658 members; and *secondly*, that by such usurpation of the ministerial functions the responsibility which should always cling as directly as possible to the *actors*, is in the first place shifted in a great measure from the ministers to parliament, and is in the latter body shared among so many, and in such various and unascertainable proportions as to be virtually no responsibility at all. With these remarks, which we throw out for the national consideration, we leave this branch of the subject.

It cannot for a moment be imagined that the aggregate of the governing and guiding talent in the whole country has diminished, or that it is inadequate to any demands that can be made upon it. There probably never was a period in our history when capacity of every kind was as rife as now, when the general intelligence of the country was so cultivated in every department, or when all ranks could furnish forth so many minds fitted to bring them honour and to do them service. The difficulty we have to contend with—the first we have to meet—is not that the total national supply of administrative and legislative ability is less than formerly, but merely that it does not now, as formerly, instinctively congregate within the walls of Parliament. Great Britain is still opu-

lent, though St. Stephens may have become impoverished and meagre. England we firmly believe to be as rich as ever in pilots who could weather every storm, in servants competent to any task, in statesmen fit to cope with any emergency. Two things only are needed to enlist all this floating and scattered genius in the service of the State:—that the Sovereign should be at liberty to select her instruments not from senators, orators, or noblemen alone, but from all ranks, descriptions, positions, and professions; and that she should be enabled to outbid all other competitors for their talents—should be empowered to offer them such rewards as will command their willing and devoted labours, in the shape either of dignity, of emolument, or of that real power of efficient usefulness, which, to the purely ambitious and truly patriotic soul, is the sweetest and richest recompense which the world's treasury contains. A very simple arrangement would suffice. Empower the Queen to call to her councils all the administrative talent, all the statesmanlike wisdom of the country, in whatsoever rank it has appeared, in whatsoever channel it has displayed itself; and where the duties of the office, or the public service makes it necessary, let the royal selection *ipso facto* confer a seat, though not a vote, in Parliament.

“The aristocratic class,” (Mr. Carlyle observes,) “from whom members of Parliament can be elected, extends only to certain thousands: from these you are to choose your Secretary, if a seat in Parliament is the primary condition. But the general population is twenty-seven millions; from all sections of which you can choose, if the seat in Parliament is not to be primary. Make it ultimate instead of primary—a last investiture instead of a first indispensable condition—and the whole British nation, learned, unlearned, professional, practical, speculative, and miscellaneous, is at your disposal! In the lowest broad strata of the population, equally as in the highest and narrowest, are produced men of every kind of genius; man for man, your chance of genius is as good among the millions as among the units;—and class for class, what must it be! From all classes, not from certain hundreds as now, but from several millions, whatsoever man the gods had gifted with intellect and nobleness and power to help his country, could be chosen.”

A considerable proportion of those whom the Queen might thus select would probably be in Parliament already: a certain proportion also, would not really need to be in Parliament at all. “Given, a good official man or secretary, he ought, as far as it is possible, to be left working in the silent state. No mortal can both work, and do good talking in Parliament, or out of it: the

feat is as impossible as that of serving two hostile masters.” But for those officials whom it was necessary to have in Parliament, both to afford needful explanations, and to defend—as only those actually engaged can fully defend—the conduct and measures of the administration, *ex officio* seats should be provided. There really is no reasonable objection that we can divine to such an obvious and simple solution of the difficulty; nor have we ever heard any urged. Not being Peers, they would of course have no votes in the House of Lords; not being elected by the people, they would of course have no votes in the House of Commons; the prerogative of neither House of Parliament would be in the slightest degree infringed. Her Majesty would simply be provided with an indispensable medium of communication with her “faithful Commons,” and her “trusty and well-beloved cousins.” But the proposition is not only indefeasibly reasonable: what is a consideration of far greater weight with John Bull, it is strictly according to, and *within* precedent.

The Queen can already, of her own free will, place any one she pleases in the House of Peers, *not only for a time, but for ever*, not only with the right of speech, but with the complete and entire privileges of the peerage. Our proposition does not go nearly this length: it gives the Queen no powers half so extensive as those she already wields. With regard to the House of Commons, it surely cannot be forgotten that up to the period of the first Reform Bill, the Crown possessed the power (with great additions) which we now propose to bestow upon it: there were a certain number of Government boroughs to the representation of which the Sovereign could at once nominate any minister she might please to appoint. In neither quarter, therefore, is our suggestion open to the charge of innovation. The amendment would be strictly in conformity with the spirit of the constitution. It would still, as now, be in the power of either House of Parliament to declare its want of confidence in the Administration, and in case of necessity to compel the Crown to change it, by withholding the necessary supplies. But it would enable the Queen to do that which the Constitution of the Realm declares to be her undoubted prerogative—viz., to select her own ministers—more effectually than at present: it would put it out of the power of any single capricious or sinister constituency to annul the appointment of the Crown: and it would no longer confine Her Majesty's choice within the narrow circle of those who are wealthy enough to adventure on a Parliamentary career, ambitious enough to rush

voluntarily into the popular arena, rich enough to buy a close borough, or hardy enough to contest an open one. It would carry out the intention of our fundamental statutes, and make this part of our boasted constitution a reality and not a sham.

But something more than this would be required. It can have escaped the attention of none who have long watched the management of public affairs in this country, that much mischief arises, and much more is permitted to continue, in consequence of the entire absorption of the time and strength of all our ministers with the daily and indispensable business of their several departments. Their whole energy is barely adequate to do what must be done, and to meet what must be met. Sufficient, and more than sufficient, to each day is the evil and the labour thereof. They are obliged to postpone, and put aside everything that is not urgent and clamorous for attention. They are wholly without the leisure either of time or mind, to take a deliberate and comprehensive survey of the several changes or amendments which the public service *needs*, but does not *demand*. They cannot dive deeply into the maladies of the nation, or the tendencies of the times. Not only can they not calmly and profoundly study what is for the public good, but they have scarcely even time carefully to examine the wisest schemes, and the most beneficial proposals which are made to them. Thus all the rich suggestions with which official experience and insight must be laden, are profitless, or nearly so, to them and to their country. They wait to propose what is needful, and to grapple with what is intolerable, till the nation discovers what their greater opportunities must have made known to them for years, and becomes so clamorous on the subject, as to render it the most important and pressing matter of the day. Then, and not till then, it is attended to. And then, being taken up under the influence of "pressure from without," it is too commonly dealt with ignorantly, hastily, and clumsily. Instances might be specified without number: we will confine ourselves to one. For many years our entire system of dealing with the criminal population has been in a position fitted to engage the most anxious attention of any wise and far-seeing statesman. Crime has been increasing, and the means of directly dealing with it have been diminishing. One or other branch of the subject has excited in its turn a partial and passing public interest, and *something* has been done, but done carelessly, unsystematically, and empirically. An outcry was raised against capital punishments; and capital punish-

ments were virtually abolished. Much indignation was excited about the state of the prisons; and prison inspectors were appointed. The system of transportation was vehemently denounced; and the Government proclaimed their determination to abandon it. Benevolent people declared that criminals should be regarded rather as unfortunate men who had been misled, and ought to be pitied and reformed, than as public enemies and dangers against which the nation had to be protected; and, accordingly, the Government have done their best to pet prisoners and "make them comfortable." Thus, the whole matter has got into an inextricable mess. We may not hang malefactors; we may not transport them; we may not even punish them with due severity at home. We may not make prisons the effective penitentiaries they ought to be, because the country would not bear the cost of its own maudlin tenderness for guilt, or because, at least, ministers think so, and, therefore, dare not apply to Parliament for the necessary funds. Public and magisterial feeling shrinks from condemning infant criminals to the hardening and corrupting influence of adult gaols; yet, nothing is done to provide juvenile and reformatory ones, because the public has not demanded them, and we have no statesman to forestall what is not demanded. And we have thousands of our youthful population annually educated into crime as a most lucrative profession; yet we do not boldly stop this fertile source of suffering and perplexity, by taking them at once out of the hands of their educators, because we are not yet prepared to interfere with "the liberty of the subject," or to rescue children from parents who are training them for hell! The whole awful question—so momentous when looked at both from the moral and the political point of view—is suffered to drift on, waiting till it shall "resolve itself,"—because our ministers have neither strength, genius, nor leisure, for the discharge of real statesmanlike functions, and because we have not yet gathered to the service of the country the men qualified to supply their deficiencies.

A very simple remedy might be found by allowing to each of the chief officers of State a sort of unofficial council in the background, to assist and advise him in matters relating to his special department,—the members of which, three or four in number, he would be at liberty to choose from any quarter and any class, and to remunerate in such a manner as to enable him to command the fittest minds the country could afford. Their functions should be to examine into the wants of the nation with a profoundness,

and to deliberate on remedial measures with a care, which the routine and heavy duties of their chief make impossible for him; to consider suggestions; to prepare plans; to regard permanent ameliorations rather than temporary expedients; and generally to be to their principal a secret and reliable supply of that *Statesmanship*, which is eminently needed, but which a life of incessant activity and antagonism effectually forbids. The country, duly searched, could furnish numbers of men, admirably fitted for such functions,—men aloof from and above the strife and turmoil of party; thoroughly acquainted with the temper of the nation as well as with its wants; with minds inured to labour, trained to political and historical investigations and enriched by the studies of ancient and modern wisdom; enlarged, sober, and philosophic; and bringing to their task an independence of feeling, a comprehensiveness of view, and a passionless serenity of judgment, which those engaged in the rough warfare of the political arena can never attain.

We are glad to be able to confirm our views by those of a writer long engaged in official life himself, and accustomed to look beyond the claims and interests of the passing hour. Mr. Taylor says:—

“Further, it is one business to do what must be done, another to devise and do what ought to be done. It is in the spirit of the British government as hitherto existing, to transact only the former business; and the reform which it requires is to enlarge that spirit so as to include the latter. Of and from among those measures which are forced upon him, to choose that which will bring him the most credit with the least trouble, has hitherto been the sole care of a statesman in office;—and as a statesman's official establishment has been heretofore constituted, it is care enough for any man. Every day, every hour, has its exigencies, its immediate demands; and he who has hardly time to eat his meals, cannot be expected to occupy himself in devising good for mankind.

“I am aware that under popular institutions, there are many measures of exceeding advantage to the people, which it would be in vain for the minister to project until the people, or an influential portion of them, should become apprized of the advantage, and should ask for it; many which can be carried only by overcoming resistance; much resistance only to be overcome with the support of popular opinion and general solicitude for the object. And, looking no further, it might seem that what is not immediately called for by the public voice was not within the sphere of practical dealing. But I am also aware, that in the incalculable extent and multifarious nature of the public interests which lie open to the operations of a statesman in this country, one whose faculties should be adequate would find in every month he should devote to the search, measures of

great value and magnitude, which time and thought only were wanting to render practicable.

“He would find them—not certainly by shutting himself up in his closet, and inventing what had not been thought of before—but by holding himself on the alert; by listening with all his ears (and he should have many ears abroad in the world) for the suggestions of circumstances; by *catching the first moment of public complaint against real evil, encouraging it, and turning it to account*;— . . . Such means and projects will suggest themselves in abundance to one who meditates the good of mankind, ‘sagacious of his quarry from afar,’—but not to a minister whose whole soul is and must be in the notices of motions, and in the order-book of the House of Commons, and who has no one behind to prompt him to other enterprise, no closet or office-statesman for him to fall back upon as upon an inner mind.

“This then is the great evil and want—that there is not within the pale of our Government any adequately numerous body of efficient statesmen, some to be externally active and answer the demands of the day, others to be somewhat more retired and meditative, in order that they may take thought for the morrow. How great the evil of this want is, it may require peculiar opportunities of observation fully to understand and feel; but one who with competent knowledge, should consider well the number and magnitude of those measures which are postponed for years or totally pretermitted, not for want of practicability, but for want of time and thought; one who should proceed with such knowledge to consider *the great means and appliances of wisdom which lie scattered through this intellectual country*,—squandered upon individual purposes, not for want of applicability to national ones, but for want of being brought together and directed; one who, surveying these things with a heart capable of a people's joys and sorrows, *their happy virtue or miserable guilt on these things dependent*, should duly estimate the abundant means unemployed and the exalted aims unaccomplished,—could not choose, I think, but say that there must be something fatally amiss in the very idea of statesmanship on which our administration is based, or that there must be some mortal apathy at what should be the very centre and seat of life in a country.

“Yet such is the prevalent insensibility to that which constitutes the real treasures and resources of the country—its serviceable and statesmanlike minds—and so far are men in power from searching the country through for such minds, or men in Parliament from promoting or permitting the search, that I hardly know if that minister has existed in the present generation, who, if such a mind were casually presented to him, would not forego the use of it, rather than hazard a debate in the House of Commons upon an additional item in his estimates! Yet till the government of this country shall become a nucleus at which the best wisdom in the country contained shall be perpetually forming itself in deposit, it will be, except as regards the shuffling of power from hand to hand and class to class, lit-

tle better than a government of fetches, shifts, and hand-to-mouth expedients."—*The Statesman*, p. 156.

When the Government has been thus empowered to call to its aid all the administrative and statesmanlike capacity of the country, it will be for the country to see that this capacity is so summoned to the rescue; that no official indolence or jealousy, no aristocratic propensities, no shallow or shortsighted economy, shall prevent its being so summoned. Thenceforth it will be the nation's fault, if the nation be ill-governed, or governed by its narrower and scantier minds. Thenceforth we may hope to see the dawning of a new legislative and administrative era for our country. Of one thing we may feel quite secure—that if all the superior floating political genius of the country be not arrayed in the service of Government, it will assuredly be arrayed against it; if it be not obtained as a coadjutor and ally, it will make itself felt as an obstructor and antagonist; if it be not allowed to strengthen the hands, to support the course, to prepare the measures of Government, it will take the initiative and drag the Government ignominiously in its train. This cannot be done without damage and without risk; it is a dangerous thing for a nation to feel itself abler and wiser than its rulers; reverence is impaired, obedience is undermined; the character of public men sinks and suffers; the language of public warfare becomes more bitter, more contemptuous, and more unmeasured; the national strength is diminished, and the national influence weakened, because the people grudge great means to men in whom they do not feel full confidence. There are many indications that we are at present tending towards such a state of things; perhaps the voice of warning may be heard in time.

The work by Mr. Roebuck which we have placed at the head of this Article, will not materially alter the estimate which the public has already formed of his abilities or of his character. It has evidently been composed with great care and diligence, and apparently with a sincere desire to give a faithful account of a most important era in our national history. The style, indeed, is rough and uncouth, and rather that of a ready speaker than of a practised writer, but it is almost always clear. The characters which he draws of the principal actors of the time, appear to be the parts of the book on which he has bestowed most thought and pains; they are skilful, discriminating, and generally, we think, correct,—those of Mr. O'Connell and Sir Robert Peel especially so. Yet notwithstanding these

merits, we have read the book with much disapproval and with sincere pain. It is not only deeply tinged, but is altogether coloured and pervaded by Mr. Roebuck's besetting sin—a disposition to think ill and to speak harshly of every one around him. This tendency, whether arising from infirmity of temper or distorted vision, has greatly impaired his usefulness in public life, and will equally detract from his merits as an historian. Ever ready to put the worst construction upon ambiguous conduct; to speak with sarcastic doubt of every reported instance of purity and generosity; of all possible motives which could have influenced public men in a given course of action to assign the lowest as most probably the true one; unable apparently to believe in the existence of lofty and conscientious patriotism among statesmen, or conceiving himself to have the entire monopoly of this virtue,—he is about the most unpleasant companion in a historical journey that can be imagined. No man with any respect for himself or any tenderness for his fellow-men, likes to walk through the market-place, arm-in-arm, with Diogenes and his lantern. The whole book is one continuous snarl, sarcasm, and sneer, delivered with the gravity and sternness of an ermined judge. It is a philippic delivered from the bench. In the guise of an elaborate history it is, in fact, a party pamphlet directed against the Whigs. Its object seems to be to shew—the opinion of the writer certainly is—that the great Reform Bill brought forward by Lord Grey was a mere hasty and improvised party move; that a real regard either for the people or the welfare of the country had no share whatever in inducing its proposal; that it was decided upon, concocted, and arranged with no purpose or idea but that of transferring the reins of Government from the Tory to the Whig aristocracy; that all its details were planned for this end; and that none were more alarmed than the proposers of the measure, when they saw the earnestness of the great body of the nation in the matter.

"The Whigs have ever been an exclusive and aristocratic faction, though at times employing democratic principles and phrases as weapons of offence against their opponents. It is the fashion of the writers who advocate their cause and eulogize their party, to describe them as representing the principle of advance and change, in the hope of improvement, which must be ever acting with a people who are themselves continually improving; but this assumption is not justified by experience. *The Whigs employ the phrases of liberality upon compulsion.* They are liberal, because they need some means of exciting the nation. When out of office, they

are demagogues; in power, they become exclusive oligarchs. In the one case and the other, they pursue without scruple what they believe to be their party interest.

"*That the Whigs, as a party, sought more than their own party advantage, [in carrying the Reform Bill,] I see no reason to believe. That they both overrated and underrated the effects of their own measure, their subsequent conduct, I think, proves. They overrated it, in supposing that they had really annihilated the political power of their opponents, and firmly established their own supremacy; they underrated it also, in fancying that they had given a dangerous power to what they called alternately a republican and a democratic party. They underrated the effect of the new Act, and mistook its influence altogether, when they supposed that the coming contests in the House of Commons were to be between themselves—representing monarchy, aristocracy, wealth and order, on the one hand, and a small but fierce and active body of republicans and anarchists on the other.*"—Vol. ii. c. v.

Now, there is unquestionably much truth at the bottom of these representations; but it is a truth exaggerated and embittered. The Whigs have always been, it is true, an exclusive and aristocratic party; their basis has been narrow, and their views rigid, pedantic, and confined, and these defects are now working their downfall. But it is not true that they have generally been either selfish, ungenerous, or corrupt,—they have been steady champions of constitutional freedom, the bold denouncers of injustice and oppression, and the energetic friends of religious liberty. To many of them we owe much gratitude and deep respect. Lord Grey in particular, though we cannot approve of much of his early political conduct, though much of it he regretted and condemned himself, was yet a pure patriot and a noble statesman. Through a long life he held aloof from place and power, because they would not have enabled him to further the objects for whose sake alone he valued them. He lived to see the day when place and power were offered to him, and the terms which he was enabled to make, were a people's emancipation. Nor, we confess, can we see the object to be gained by impressing on the minds of the nation the conviction that their rulers are selfish and cold-hearted intriguers; by sapping all reverence for public men, and encouraging the people to look upon them with enmity or with suspicion, or by inculcating as the spirit in which statesmen should be judged and watched, a temper that thinketh much evil, and that covereth no sins.

ART. II.—*The Constitution of Man considered in Relation to External Objects.* By GEORGE COMBE. Edinburgh, 1851.

THE work which we have placed at the head of this Article has by name, at least, been long familiar to the public. We say by name, not because its actual circulation has been small, but because we believe that the number of those who have read it, is at least small when compared with the number of those who have as decided an opinion of its character as if they had. It is often referred to as belonging to a set of works usually to be found on the shelves of the chartist and the infidel: and under this general impression it is avoided by a large class of readers. This is hardly a safe state of matters in connexion with such a book. It has passed through seven or eight editions, and boasts of a circulation of some 90,000. If, therefore, it be true, as a matter of fact, that it is often associated with very doubtful company, the characteristics which make it acceptable there must be an important subject of inquiry. Is it from any direct attacks on revealed religion? If not, censures founded on this supposition will only tend to strengthen the influence of any errors it may really contain. Short of this, however, it may be from an indirect connexion between the principles it involves, and the opinions of the class referred to—a connexion possibly real, though not seen by the author—possibly erroneous, and such as would be repudiated by him. In this case reasoning and discussion cannot be too much directed to sift its views, and point out their real tendency. Again, it may be simply from the absence of any reference to the doctrines of religion, that the "Constitution of Man" is said to be so much read by those to whom that absence is agreeable. In this case the author may plead, as he actually does, that the nature of his subject justifies the omission, and that the vague idea of its hostility to the cause of religion has no other foundation, than that nervous jealousy which has beset every new branch of the natural sciences, before its bearing and results were thoroughly understood.

Now, in dealing with this book, we hold that one charge, and one plea in defence, must be both dismissed. It is certainly untrue, that this work contains any direct or wilful attack on the Christian Faith, which is always spoken of in general terms at least expressive of respect. There are no dishonest hints or malignant sneers. Christianity is frequently referred to as being true, and the Scriptures as possessing authority. When conclusions of the author

are opposed to any given tenet commonly held by the Christian world, he uniformly represents himself as disputing not the authority of Revelation, but the popular interpretation of its words: and as regards the "practical results" on conduct, he makes the anxious but somewhat negative declaration, that to the best of his knowledge there is not one of them, as the "result of the natural laws expounded in the subsequent pages, which does not harmonize precisely with the moral precepts of the New Testament."

But when Mr. Combe deprecates criticism as to the religious bearing of his work, on the general plea that he confines himself to the domain of natural science, or to quote his own words, "exclusively to man as he exists in the present world"—we can only accept it with great reserve. We admit, indeed, the necessity of meeting the man of science on scientific ground; and the danger of committing the authority of the Bible to any conclusions, which researches in the physical world may be competent to overthrow. But it is one thing to admit the independence of the physical observer, and another to admit the total irrelevance of his subject or his reasonings, as regards the things which belong to faith. The truth is, that there is no branch of human inquiry, however purely physical, which is more than the word *branch* implies; none which is not connected through endless ramifications with every other—and, especially, with that which is the root and centre of them all. If He, who formed the mind, be one with Him who is the orderer of all things about which that mind is occupied, there can be no end to the points of contact between our conceptions of them, of Him, and of ourselves. Whilst, therefore, it is folly to attempt to stop, by a religious interdict, the progress of the man of science in his own walk, it is both right and wise to follow his steps with a jealous and watchful care. Jealous—did we say?—yes, but a jealousy not of the subject, only of the inquirer. The very ground on which that jealousy is felt as regards the one, ought to be ground of sure hope in reference to the other. If the natural sciences, in certain stages of their progress, are apt to raise objections in the minds of some to the truth of revealed religion, let us never be tempted to escape from the difficulty, by denying that deep connexion which is undeniable, and whose existence is witnessed by the very misinterpretations it suggests. Let us rather look to that connexion as the highest source of interest in the physical sciences, and as promising through their endless analogies, and suggestive types, new and inex-

haustible proofs of harmony between the word and works of God.

Certainly, if there is one subject of inquiry, which less than others, can be viewed as separate from the domain of religious faith, it is that to which this work of Mr. Combe refers. The CONSTITUTION OF MAN—was there ever so large a title—not a physical description of this or that organ of man's body, or this or that function of his frame, but a treatise on the constitution of *Man*, with all his powers of body or of mind? It is true, that Mr. Combe adds, "considered in relation to external objects"—words which in themselves may mean anything or nothing, but the intended import of which is probably better conveyed in the form before quoted—"man as he exists in the present world." But so little does Mr. Combe find it possible to restrict the range of his speculations, that we find him defining limits to the efficacy of prayer; and stating his own inference, as to the invariable manner of operation of the Divine Spirit. But, indeed, illustration is needless on such a point. The belief that man, "as he exists in this world," is to have a personal identity with himself, as he is to exist in the world to come, is essential to the idea of a future state: and it is clearly very possible that doctrine taught as to his "constitution" here, may and must, more or less, affect our notions of his prospects hereafter.

Consenting, therefore, to follow Mr. Combe on his own ground of inquiry, whether physical or metaphysical—but refusing to put off the watchfulness which arises from a knowledge that the path on which he treads leads us directly into the mysteries of the Spirit, and the deep things which belong to God—we proceed to walk with him for a while into this land of things very real, but very darkly seen: and we apprehend, that in judging of the safety of our guide, there are two questions mainly which we should endeavour to determine, *first*, Are those things which he does see, seen rightly, and in their due proportion? *secondly*, Are there other things which he has overlooked altogether—in themselves, or in their bearing on the rest?

As to the general drift and purport of this book, let us hear the author. His account of his own production is really fair. "I lay no claim to originality of conception. . . . The materials employed lie open to all. Taken separately, I would hardly say, that a new truth has been presented in the following work. The facts have nearly all been admitted, and employed again and again, by writers on morals from the time of Socrates down to the present day. The

only novelty in this work respects the relations which acknowledged truths hold to each other." So, then, the beads are old, but the string is new; and never was such value set upon so strange a thread. The essential element of the work is referred to, as a system of *mental philosophy* the "clearest, most complete, and best supported" which has hitherto been taught. It is spoken of, as opening up a new path to human improvement alike in morals, politics, and religion. For the want of it, we are told, all previous works on mental science—that of Dr. Chalmers in his *Bridgewater Treatise*, as well as the rest of that celebrated group of writings—in short, many of the highest efforts of genius and learning have been comparatively wasted, throwing "extremely little new light on the moral government of the world."—What can this "theory of mind" be? Most men would think it better distinguished as a "theory of matter"—in this important respect, that its special distinction from other "philosophies of mind" is, that it is founded on the physiology of the brain. It is Phrenology!

Referring Mr. Combe, then, to the large development of our organ of combativeness, we pass over the "acknowledged truths," and proceed at once to this new "philosophy of mind," by which old facts are to be drilled into new form and order. It is not needful to define Phrenology. Every one knows, generally, what it is, and what it means. In this work our author "assumes" it, giving only an outline, and referring for more minute details to works expressly devoted to the subject. And as he assumes it—so shall we. That is to say, we do not care to oppose it; nor do we share in the hostility entertained by many against this "science" in itself. It is very true, that phrenology may be chosen by minds of a certain class, as the basis of a gross materialism. But this may be said, and is actually true, of most, if not of all the natural sciences. The great question always is—not whether such deductions are, or may be drawn, but whether they are logical and true? Though not ourselves phrenologists, we should be very sorry to stake our faith in a single spiritual truth, on the successful disproof of any of its assumed facts. The truth is, that the main fact—that of which all the rest are, as it were, but subdivisions more or less justified by observation—is one which has been instinctively assumed in every age and country. "That man has no brains!" is a sentence on mental capacity which would be universally understood, and would have been equally intelligible before Gall and Spurzheim were born. How painfully does

the brain sometimes indicate its functions! A slight blow—a temporary pressure on that mysterious substance, will break down for ever the powers of a lofty intellect. Then, what is it in the aspect of idiocy, in many of its forms, which we instantly recognise and never can mistake? In that low, pinched and retiring brow, instinct tells us that reason cannot hold her seat. That there is a connexion, and a close and intimate connexion too, between the powers of thought, and the development of brain, is known by the millions who never question the grounds of their belief, as certainly as to the few who have made it the subject of special observation and research. These last, indeed, know farther, that it is a connexion not limited to our own species, but extending over the whole range of animal life, from man down to the reptile and the fish. This is the great *fact* which may, undoubtedly, be so perverted as to form the plausible basis of a materialistic philosophy. But we do not see, that the farther *refinements* on this fact which phrenology has made, are in this respect one whit more formidable than the fact itself. If it be true, that there is a direct relation between the mind and the brain, each considered as a whole, we see no ground for alarm, if it should also prove to be a fact, that there is a similar relation between the separate regions of the one, and the several faculties of the other. At first sight this may seem a great step in advance: and so in one sense it is; but not in that sense in which, perhaps, it may be heralded by some friends, as it certainly is dreaded by many enemies of phrenology. It is the discovery of some detailed points of contact in that general connexion which has long been known: but it is not one hair's-breadth advance towards any explanation of the nature or source of that connexion in itself. Still less does it tend to justify the reasoning which confounds connexion with identity. Yet we are not surprised at the anxiety, which arose from a first view of the announcements of phrenology. When, for example, Mr. Combe takes in his hand that human skull, and lifting off its upper cover, tell us that the oval of convoluted matter thus exposed to view, "*manifests the Moral Sentiments*"—with what feelings can we receive the statement? The *MORAL SENTIMENTS*—what do not these include? The power of seeing moral beauty, and of loving truth—the sense of justice, and the desire of serving in her cause—conscience and benevolence, charity and faith—all that is best and noblest in the human spirit—these are what we are told are "*manifested there!*" Some, of course, will turn

away with ridicule and disgust. For ourselves, we listen with no such feelings. We watch, indeed, the evidence on which the assertion is made, the inferences drawn from it, and last, not least, the very terms in which it is conveyed, with almost as fixed attention as we gaze on the object to which those terms refer. But we do not reject it with absolute incredulity; because we know some things connected with that abode of life, which are at least analogous, and as full of wonder.

Now, as regards terms and forms of statement, no writer ever required to be more closely watched than Mr. Combe. A "mental philosophy"—a "theory of mind," what can he mean by this as a description of phrenology? Words, which ought to be the servants of thought, are so often its masters, that this becomes a question of the first importance. Does he mean to represent it as telling us anything on the *nature* of mind—on the *source* of its powers—or even one new fact concerning the scientific division of its faculties? If he does not, in what sense is it a philosophy of mind? If he does, let us cross-question him on the extent of this pretension. Phrenology maps the human head into a series of minute divisions, and allocates to each of these some known faculty of mind; but does it profess to have discovered these faculties themselves? It seems to be forgotten that this mapping of the brain can only proceed upon a previous mapping of the mind; and that this last no more belongs to the department of the phrenologist than the perception of national character in a people belongs to the department of the geographer who surveys their country. The geographer may, indeed, be also an acute observer of human nature, and in taking the measurement of their abode, he may likewise take accurate observations of their capacity and genius. He may go farther, and fitting to each other these two classes of fact, he may observe that vague but undoubted connexion which obtains between the character of a race, and the physical condition of the region in which they live. But geography is not, on this account, a philosophy of mind, and the greater closeness of connexion between the texture of mind and the development of brain does not redeem the confusion of thought which is implied in this description of phrenology. The phre-

nologist may, indeed, be also an excellent metaphysician: but the process by which we observe in others, or analyze in ourselves, those various faculties of the mind which are capable of being separately considered, is wholly independent of that after process by which we find for them a local habitation in the regions of the brain. The phrenologist must not be allowed to cut out any new faculties to distribute among his bumps; nor to confound under a single name powers which, in the same point of view, are essentially distinct. His business is simply topographical—to reconcile, as best he may, the observed phenomena of the mind with the outward mouldings of a material organ. And in the observation of these phenomena themselves, mental science is not only absolutely independent of phrenology, but phrenology is absolutely dependent upon it. In all reasoning, we must have a basis of fact already known, from which to argue to other facts which remain to be discovered. Now, in this case, the *mental* facts are those which must be known or assumed before phrenology can even render intelligible the *physical* facts which she undertakes to prove. If, for example, it were not a well-known fact, that pugnacity of disposition is a distinct feature in some men's characters, capable of being distinguished from other qualities of their mind, the phrenologist would be compelled to choose some other name for that section of the brain which he now rails off for "combativeness." And so with every other "organ." The very word enforces our explanation. If the phrenologist consents to accept such division of the mental faculties as a higher science than his own has established, he is welcome to find for them, if he can, a separate corner in the house of thought. But if he makes one such division for himself which is not approved by the consciousness or experience of mankind, then must his imaginary lines be obliterated or changed.*

To call phrenology, then, a "philosophy of mind," can only be accounted for on one of two suppositions;—either that the writer uses very careless language, covering a real confusion of idea: or else that a pretension is advanced on behalf of phrenology not merely to point out the *places where*, but the *manner how* the brain and mind are mutually connected: or, in other words, to advance a "theory of mind," based on certain

* We need hardly say, that we accept the term "Phrenology," simply as that assumed for the "science." "Craniology" is repudiated as a nickname: though, since the only accessible mode of measuring the brain is by measuring the cranium, the latter is the fairer term of the two.

* It is impossible to consider the 35 heads under which Phrenology divides the mental faculties, without seeing that they are extremely arbitrary and extremely imperfect. But this is a subject which we cannot pursue.

phenomena of matter, as regards the *source* and *nature* of its powers. Yet when Mr. Combe has occasion to bespeak the favour of readers who disbelieve his favourite science, he takes care to recognize the distinction we have pointed out, and separates, with tolerable justice, between the provinces of physiology and metaphysics. He says in the preface to this edition, "We are physical, organic, and moral beings, acting under general laws, whether the connexion of different mental qualities with particular portions of the brain, as taught by phrenology, be admitted or denied. In so far, therefore, as this work treats of the known qualities of man, it may be instructive even to those who condemn phrenology as unfounded." Here the important truth, obvious enough, certainly, is admitted, that phrenology can only refer "mental qualities" already "known" to a local connexion previously unknown. Yet totally forgetting that of these two connected things—the qualities of mind and the particular portions of brain—the important one as regards the "philosophy of mind" is that division of its faculties which is well known and familiar, he uniformly speaks as if the foundation of that philosophy were the discovery of the associated bits of matter; and as if, instead of the skull being mapped from the observations of mind, the mind were to be mapped under the diagrams of the phrenologist.

Throughout the "Constitution of Man" this strange inversion of ideas betrays itself in forms which, if sometimes mischievous as regards the truths of moral science, are, at least, very often droll in the images they present. Mr. Combe's philosophy is like a glass in which we see everything upside down. Everything is regarded, as it were, from a cerebral point of view. A man is but an agglomeration of bumps; his conduct the result of their "spontaneous" activities: and historical events but the issue of their combinations. Moral principles are but laws of brain, and cannot be really understood, unless treated of in proper cerebral phraseology. Under the Chapter of calamities arising from the infringement of the moral laws, many examples are given of the new light which this method is supposed to cast. For example, the retribution which arises from the indulgence of cruelty and selfishness in the treatment of the lower animals, is referred to by Mr. Combe, in the supposed case of a carter "who half starves his horse, and unmercifully beats it." Now, the vicious dispositions which such conduct shews, and the higher qualities of mind which it proves to be absent, or in abeyance, are all of them

not difficult to specify in the ordinary forms of language. But Mr. Combe evidently thinks that a flood of new light is cast upon the subject, by informing us that this carter "manifests excessive Destructiveness with deficient Benevolence, Veneration, Justice and Intellect." The consequences of such a character are very properly described as pursuing him in every relation of life, and the result, we are told is, that his active cerebral faculties "rouse Combativeness, Destructiveness, Self-Esteem, Secretiveness, and Cautiousness, in his wife, children, or associates, against him, and they inflict on him animal punishment." Very sound moral philosophy all this, doubtless; but, proceeding on a "theory of mind" vastly older than Mr. Combe or his master, and to which their science has added nothing. So far as any novelty in this respect is concerned, Mr. Combe might as well expect it from proceeding to describe, anatomically, the precise nature of that "animal punishment" which the carter's wife, &c., are supposed to have inflicted, and the particular muscles called into play in the course of their laudable exertions. Again, the moral judgment of our time has pretty well settled the character and disposition in which the slave-trade originated, and which the prosecution of it tended to aggravate. Mr. Combe volunteers his phrenological explanation, that England was guilty of this crime, "under the impulses of excessively strong Acquisitiveness, Self-Esteem, and Destructiveness." The first American war, likewise, is rescued from the imperfect judgment of former historians, and Britain is described as having "desired to gratify her Acquisitiveness and Self-Esteem in opposition to Benevolence and Justice." "This roused," we are farther told, "the animal resentment" of the transatlantic colonies, and "the propensities of the two nations came into collision:" "that is to say"—says Mr. Combe, naïvely, aware of the necessity of a translation—"they made war upon each other." There is no end to the illumination which this phrenological verbiage is supposed to cast on the most familiar doctrines of moral and mental philosophy. There is one doctrine shortly expressed in the popular proverb, that "Honesty is the best policy," which is made the subject of a very elaborate explanation from a text of Grecian history. It occurred to Themistocles, in a time of profound peace, that it would be very convenient for Athens to destroy the naval power of Sparta, by burning her fleet. Aristides is reported to have said, that doubtless it would be very advantageous, but equally unjust. This verdict was certainly not in a

spirit of literal acceptance of the doctrine of our proverb—and Mr. Combe objects that it was still more clearly contradictory and wrong, when tested by the science which deals with brain. He undertakes, therefore, to “trace the project of Themistocles to its result,” thus:—

“The inhabitants of Sparta possessed the faculties of Self-Esteem, Combaticiveness, Destructiveness, Intellect, Benevolence, and Conscientiousness. The proposed destruction of their ships would have outraged the higher sentiments and intellect, and these would have kindled Combaticiveness and Destructiveness into the most intense activity. The greater the injustice of the act the fiercer would the flame of opposition and revenge have glowed. . . . The Athenians, then, by the very constitution of nature, would have been assailed by this fearful storm of moral indignation and animal resentment, rendered doubly terrible by the most virtuous and intelligent being converted into the most determined of their opponents. Turning to their own State, again, only those individuals among themselves in whom intellect and moral sentiment were inferior to Acquisitiveness and Self-Esteem, which gave rise to selfishness and the lust of power, could have cordially opposed the deed.”

And so, Mr. Combe proves to his own satisfaction what we think has often been proved before, with at least equal force, and much greater brevity, that dishonesty has a natural tendency to bring about its own reward.

What is the meaning of all this? It may be excellent sense as regards what is old and familiar in moral principles; it is nonsense as regards the new light which the phrenological jargon is supposed to cast upon them. Why does Mr. Combe imagine that the well-known qualities of the human mind become for the first time clearly understood when the initial letters of their names are printed in capitals? It is for the purpose, of course, of continually referring our thoughts and his own to the material “organ”—to the little spot of brain. But why does he set such prodigious value on this reference—why does he think it amounts to a new “philosophy of mind?” Why, for example, when he speaks of justice or benevolence, will he insist on withdrawing our contemplation from those familiar ideas of their nature, which the mind immediately apprehends, and for which it loves their names, and force us to fix our outward eyes instead on a bit of skull? What new information does he think that surface can give us of the nature of those glorious spiritual attributes which are the joy of earth and heaven? What can it be that makes him fancy light from such a source—ah! we

see the illusion. The notion has arisen in the mind of the phrenologist, that he has discovered not merely the house which is the abode of mind—but a material thing which is that mind itself, and that the looking at and handling of this substance is a looking at and handling of the faculties of the soul. Such ideas may not be definitely expressed—they may not be even consciously entertained. But this is the *direction* in which a habit of looking at the phenomena of mind through the mere physiology of the brain will infallibly tend, and nothing else can account for the extravagance of representing the facts of phrenology as constituting a new theory or philosophy of mind. It is the peculiar danger of this particular science, that unless the man who comes to know its facts, habitually regards them with reference to *other* facts with which it cannot deal, and which are beyond its ken, his pretended philosophy is very apt to degenerate into a gross materialism.

As it is thus a matter of first importance to keep phrenology in its proper place as regards the idea we form of *what it is*, so also is it important to keep it in its proper place in respect to *what it does*. A number of inferences will suggest themselves, from the fact that different mental qualities are connected with different portions of brain; but the precise character of these inferences will depend on what the nature of that “connexion” is. Let us push on then to the great question—how far, and in what sense, is the brain and its several parts, the “organ” of the mind and of its various powers?

Mr. Combe, in context with the passage before quoted, says, “Individuals under the impulse of passion, or by the direction of intellect, will hope, fear, wonder, perceive, and act, *whether the degree in which they habitually do so be ascertainable by the means which it (phrenology) points out, or not.*” Here we have an intimation that the connexion between the brain and the mind may be such, that we can determine by external form, the “degree” in which individuals are “habitually” under the influence of the several faculties. Now, even supposing this to be strictly and literally true, we need hardly say, that it in no way helps phrenology to assume the rank of a “philosophy of mind.” The fact of men differing from each other in natural character, and in the dispositions which exercise habitual influence on their conduct, is as much a matter of instinctive knowledge, as the fact of those dispositions being themselves different. As in relation to the abstract consideration of the human mind, the known division of its powers is

the only basis for the partitioning of brain, so it is only the known fact of the variety of individual character which can give meaning to the varieties of organic conformation. Here again, Mr. Combe is perpetually guilty of the confusion of setting more value on the new discovery, that the "organs" vary in size, than on the very old one, that the faculties vary in power. He thinks this of such importance in the "philosophy of man," that the circumstance of its having been unknown until Dr. Gall's discovery of the functions of the brain, is sufficient to explain the past barrenness of mental science, and to render probable the assertion, "that a great flood of light on this subject is now pouring forth on the world." If the discovery of a process by which character is to be recognized in external forms be such an event, then must physiognomy also be a "philosophy of mind," and he who reads with discernment the lines of the human countenance, is as great a philosopher as the man who arrives at a similar result by measuring the "organs."

The truth is, we suspect, that the science of nature, which interprets the "human face divine," has forestalled much of what is best established in the "science" of the Man of Bumps. The material forms which tell with such force so many secrets of the spirit, have among them, as one of their component parts, the general aspect and calibre of the head, with many others which are beyond the department of phrenology. Of the dispositions this is eminently true; and in endless cases it is true also of the intellect. Genius often betrays its presence by a glance, where its throne is not visible on the brow.

Now, how far has phrenology really advanced our powers of discerning character, even assuming the whole of its topographical survey to be accurately made? We readily admit, that if there be a connexion between the "qualities of mind and certain portions of brain," there must certainly be some corresponding connexion, perhaps a visible one, between the peculiarities of a man's character and the peculiarities of his cerebral development. But when the phrenologist is asked for the formula which his science has enabled him to construct, for arriving at the required result, we find that the powers of his "philosophy" are very humble indeed, if compared with the pretensions advanced on its behalf.

"It has been ascertained," says Mr. Combe, "that each faculty is connected with a particular portion of brain: and that, OTHER CONDITIONS BEING THE SAME, the power

of manifesting each bears a relation to the size of its organ." The form of expression is slightly varied in another passage: The brain is the organ of mind: different parts of it manifest distinct faculties; and the "power of manifestation in regard to each, is proportionate, *cæteris paribus*, to the size and activity of the organ." Nothing can be more satisfactorily vague. Mr. Combe does not tell us that the organ "manifests" the faculty—but only that it has a "power" of manifesting it. He does not tell us any law by which we may determine how often that "power" is put into operation; and with regard to the extent of the "power," he is content to say, "that it bears a relation to the size" of its material counterpart. This is something: but then in the second form, he seems to fear lest even this should be too definite to be free from the danger of contradiction, and so he adds to "size" the important element, "activity." But with all these precautions to avoid a precision incompatible with facts, he is not satisfied, and casts total uncertainty over the whole, by the general rider, "*cæteris paribus*."

Now what are the mental phenomena, to which the phrenologist must shape and suit his theory—and to be consistent with which he finds it so difficult to express the practical result of his science? True it is, one man differs from another man in natural character: but true it is also, that one man differs during his life, quite as widely from himself. He is a reprobate perhaps for years—living in defiance of every law of God and man; reckless, selfish, intemperate. Sometimes slowly, sometimes suddenly he is changed. Every law which he had broken is now his guide. He is scrupulous, generous, benevolent, and temperate in all things. These latter qualities must have, and must have always had, their appropriate "organs" in his brain; and among the many cases of such a change in character, we are not aware that any corresponding growth has been observed among the bumps. Clearly then, the phrenologist is wise when he qualifies the test of "size" by the more important element of "activity." But then size can be estimated—activity cannot. There have, indeed, been opportunities we are told, of actually seeing the "activity" of a brain. A poor woman in France lost a portion of her skull—and during a sleep of agitated dreams, that mysterious substance which is honoured by this incomprehensible alliance, was seen to be agitated also. But could the curious physicians who saw those movements read the moving thoughts? Could the motion of those keys enable them to hear the music? At all events we are safe in saying, that the opportunities of seeing

such "activity" are rare. Then, if this knowledge be an essential element to enable the phrenologist to determine character from the "organs," he must either trepan his patient to enable him to acquire it: or else he must descend to the level of the vulgar, and watch the signs of "activity" in life and conduct. If, on the other hand, the phrenologist pretends that size alone is enough for him, then the notorious facts of every day's experience are contradicted—to wit, that faculties are often dormant, remaining undeveloped until some sudden change of circumstances calls them into activity—and with many in whose case no such change happens, are carried undeveloped to the grave. On the other hand, it is equally notorious that the strongest tendencies of natural character are vanquished and overcome; that faculties originally strong become feeble, and powers naturally feeble are made strong. These are the undoubted facts of psychological science; and to these facts the mere physiologist must bow with absolute submission. No wonder then, that he finds it necessary to fence with innumerable reservations his rules for measuring phrenologically the varieties of individual character. The young man of dissolute and selfish life is brought to him, and he finds perhaps benevolence and conscientiousness largely developed; and although he observes also other faculties of equal or perhaps greater size, he pronounces, let us suppose, a character which gives a prominent place to the active virtues. When told that the actual conduct does not correspond with this description, he must retain it in his power to say, that although the organs referred to are really large, it is quite possible they may not be "active." The same individual, let us suppose, comes before him in that later life which has become so completely changed, and the phrenologist seeing the animal propensities largely represented in his brain, draws naturally an unfavourable inference. On being told of the high character of this man's walk and conversation, he must again retain it in his power to say, that though these propensities are large, they may be suppressed or put to sleep, and so through the whole range of the faculties, propensities, and powers, the phrenologist can judge of "size" only, and the all important element of "activity" is beyond his range of vision. The large "organ" may be sluggish, the little "organ" may be in ceaseless play: and for every discrepancy of whatever amount and degree between the actual character or conduct of the man, and the size and capacities of his brain, the phrenologist must still farther

keep for his own protection—over and above the explanation of activity—the broad shield of his "*cæteris paribus*." There is nothing which may not be included under this comprehensive salvo—it embraces everything which makes man different from himself—though never altering the outline of his skull.

The result is, that as Mr. Combe has wholly mistaken phrenology in respect to what it is, when he calls it a "philosophy of mind" so also does he misstate it in respect to what it *does*, when he speaks of it enabling us to "ascertain the degree in which individuals *habitually feel and act*, whether under the impulse of the passions or by direction of the intellect." The utmost that phrenology can do, granting its proofs complete—would be to indicate a general idea of the *original elements* of a given mind—its natural tendencies of disposition, and capacity of powers. But it can tell us nothing of the whole which these elements have combined to form—because it knows nothing of the proportions in which they have been united. It cannot tell which has been cultivated, or which left waste—which encouraged and which repressed. It can tell us something of the soil, but nothing of the crop.

Entertaining as we do a profound respect for every one of the natural sciences, we should never be disposed to contest, without adequate inquiry, the observations of those who are devoted to their study. But it is lawful to march round the enclosures, and to see that the bounds are kept. We do not, therefore, dispute any of the facts which phrenology professes to have discovered in respect to the physiological connexion between the parts of brain and the faculties of mind; and we should hail with pleasure any aid which this fact may be able to lend us in forecasting, earlier than could otherwise be done, the natural elements of character, and in so directing the education of the young, as to run with their natural abilities, and strengthen them against their natural defects. But perhaps there is no science which demands such vigilance against the tendency of its disciples to stray beyond the limits of legitimate induction. From the habit they acquire of looking at mental phenomena entirely through the medium of physical organization, they are apt to overvalue those which seem most clearly to depend upon, or to be influenced thereby; and to undervalue, or overlook, those others which are most purely spiritual, and which indicate the subordination of matter under the power of mind. A curious instance of the effect of looking on

all mental phenomena from the mere anatomical point of view, is to be found in a passage in one of the works of Dr. Andrew Combe, brother of our author, which has been ably edited by Dr. Cox. He says, "We can no more form a conception of the abstract qualities of mind disjoined from the body, than we can of the principle of gravitation as separated from matter." Now, to every human being except an M.D., an assertion exactly the reverse would be nearer the truth. Our difficulty is not to form any conception whatever of a separation between mind and matter, but of their connexion. When we think of the qualities of mind we always think of them in the abstract, and it is only with difficulty and effort that we can associate those qualities with bits of brain. This is admitted and well expressed by the same author in a subsequent passage. "We cannot conceive even in the remotest manner, in what way the brain,—a compound of water, albumen, fat and phosphate salts, operates in the generating of thought." So long, however, as physiologists keep within the limits of their own immediate subject, their materialism is natural and comparatively harmless; but it is when they cross into the adjacent territories of morals and religion, that this language comes to involve fallacies of the most dangerous kind. Let us look for a moment at the treatment bestowed by Mr. Combe upon questions of moral science, when these are treated in the light of his phrenological doctrine.

The fact of men being born with natural characters extremely various, and strongly impressed upon them from the womb, is, as we have already observed, one long familiar to the observation of the world, before "phrenology" undertook to connect it with the corresponding fact of congenital varieties in the development of the brain. And as the fact is an old one, so also are the difficulties it suggests touching the question of moral responsibility. If we look only at the familiar fact that propensities exist in some individuals in great excess, and that they are placed in circumstances of strong temptation, we may be sometimes disposed to argue that responsibility in such cases does not exist, or is so modified in character as hardly to deserve the name. This is only one of the forms in which the great question of man's freewill encounters us, whether in morals or theology; and although the difficulties which it presents are real, there is always the one great and sufficient answer, that man's own consciousness, against which there is no appeal in the mental sciences, proclaims a responsibility from which no

subtlety of argument can relieve him. Then as the idea of responsibility admits of—indeed involves varieties of degree, of these we must be content to leave the adjustment to Him who only knows completely the elements on which that adjustment must depend. The difficulties which perplex arise in fact from our attempting a task which neither our knowledge nor our faculties enable us to discharge. Now on this great question phrenology can throw not one ray of independent light, whilst at the same time its disciples are prone to imagine that it supplies them with all, or much that before was wanting to the solution of the problem. The certainty that men are born with particular tendencies strongly impressed upon their mental constitution, is not one whit increased by the discovery that there are corresponding developments of brain; but the same confusion of thought which we have traced throughout in the language of Mr. Combe, pursues the phrenologist into this higher subject. He fancies that his science not only does lend a new certainty to the fact referred to, but also that it gives to each such tendency a more absolute and independent existence. He is so accustomed to consider mind only in relation to something that he can feel, and touch, and measure, that when he sees any organ developed in excess, he fancies he has got not only a new proof of the corresponding tendency, but a new idea of the relation in which it stands to the whole constitution of the human spirit. He is disposed to view conduct simply as the result of separate impulsive powers, to sink consideration of those higher endowments to which no determinate place can be assigned, and especially of that independent will to which the exercise of moral control belongs. Hence Mr. Combe speaks of the "*cause*" of a criminal's conduct, just as he would speak of the "*causes*" of the phenomena of matter; and he stigmatizes the moral indignation against him, which arises from the instinct of moral responsibility, as "animal resentment." Thus in reference to the sources of crime, we are told that phrenology has "enabled us to answer" that these are three; "first, from particular organs being too large, and *spontaneously* too active; secondly, from great excitement produced by *external* causes; or thirdly, from *ignorance* of what are uses and what are abuses of the faculties. These causes *exist independently of the will of the offender*. The criminal, for example, is not the cause of the unfortunate preponderance of the animal organs in his brain, neither is he the creator of the external circumstances which lead his propensities into abuse, or of the ignorance

in which he is involved." In confirmation of all this, Mr. Combe tells us that he has examined the cerebral development of a considerable number of criminals, and inquired into the external circumstances in which they had been placed, and "he has no hesitation in saying, that in the case of every offender, if the three sources of crime here enumerated had been investigated, the conviction would have become general, that the individual had been the *victim of his nature* and external circumstances." If this be the new "philosophy of mind," we can only say that this is subversive of the first truths of moral science—truths in themselves both infinitely more important, and infinitely better ascertained, than any which Phrenology reveals. Phrenology, however, is not to blame. Its facts afford no shadow of justification for such doctrines, which are dangerous only because thoroughly unphilosophical.

First of all, be it observed, that the above enumeration of the sources of crime professes to be a complete one; the assertion is, that crime proceeds from these, *and these only*, for, of course, if the list is incomplete, it would not be announced as the basis of an argument on general principles. Now, it is certainly true, in a loose popular sense, that strong natural propensities, circumstances of great temptation, and ignorance, are amongst the sources of crime. But are there not others, the most abundant of all, of which these are, in truth, but the tributary streams? Where is the consenting WILL? Where is the intellect?—that which Mr. Combe elsewhere tells us, "is universal in its applications," but whose "proper use" it is "to *direct* the propensities and sentiments to their proper and legitimate enjoyments." Is the perversion of these high powers, and the abandonment of their directing duties, not worthy of being named among the "sources of crime?" But we pass from this, because our objection to Mr. Combe's enumeration is not simply that it is fragmentary when it pretends to be complete, but that it is essentially erroneous. We must speak with logical precision in a question so abstract, and of such momentous import; and if such precision be attended to, it will be clear that not one of those in Mr. Combe's list is, in reality, a source of crime at all. He forgets what crime is. It is not simply evil, but evil arising only out of one definite source—and that source the very one excluded by Mr. Combe,—viz: the action of a WILL which is free and responsible. The crime of murder, for example, is not simply the killing of a man. "Destructiveness" may be the source of

this evil, but if it be "destructiveness" as developed in a beast of prey—that is to say, if it be "destructiveness" apart from a responsible will, no man ever calls its indulgence a "crime." In like manner, the infliction of death by a maniac, is due to the action of destructiveness, which action, however, is not in him considered criminal, simply because he is supposed to have lost that responsible will, on the possession of which the very idea of criminality depends. The animal propensities, therefore, the outward circumstances which excite them, and ignorance of what is good, are indeed the sources of innumerable acts entailing evil on ourselves or others; but these acts are only "crimes" when considered as the acts of a being who *could* have controlled these propensities, *could* have resisted the temptations, and whose ignorance, however great, still left him the knowledge of right and wrong. When these conditions do not exist, man is not himself; and then though his actions may be evil, they cannot be criminal. It is only, therefore, by carefully excluding from the inquiry the very elements which are most essential to it, by reducing him to the level of the beasts who have no reason, or of the maniac who has lost it, that this writer on the "Constitution of Man" contrives to represent the criminal as the mere victim of his "nature," and of external circumstances.

The mischievous nonsense on which we have thus commented, is not unconnected with one of the features of this work which is most pleasing, and has, doubtless, much contributed to its popularity, viz., the general benevolence of its views. It occurs in the chapter which is devoted to the investigation of the subject of "Punishment," as conducted under the operation of the natural laws, and of the laws of man. Mr. Combe's opinions on this subject are such as to require that negation of moral responsibility which we have seen him thus attempt to establish. A definition of the sources of "crime" which excludes the idea of criminality, is the natural basis of a rule for the treatment of crime which excludes the idea of punishment. Mr. Combe absolutely objects to the idea of a *retributive* infliction of suffering. He would shut up the murderer exactly on the same principle on which he would shut up a lunatic,—first of all, for the sake of prevention; and, secondly, for the sake of cure. But the infliction of any suffering not necessarily involved in the effecting of these objects he considers the result of the "yet untamed barbarism of our own minds." Now, it is obvious that the idea of punishment, pro-

perly so called, is not recognised at all under this system. Punishment, like crime, is a relative term—relative to the very element which Mr. Combe excludes. Punishment is something more than mere *suffering*. It is only in a derived and secondary sense that we should apply the word at all to the suffering accidentally incurred, for example, by one of the lower animals; nor does the treatment to which the lunatic is subjected, though involving suffering, more or less, ever receive the name. The essential idea of punishment is, that *kind* of suffering which the sentiment of justice perceives to be due, retributively, to the infraction of a moral duty, by a responsible agent. Accordingly, in order to forbid this *kind* of suffering, Mr. Combe finds it necessary to exclude as much as possible, the element of a free moral will: and hence that enumeration of the sources of crime, so carefully framed to keep out of sight the existence of such a will. In conducting this operation, Mr. Combe exhibits a facility of shutting his eyes, for the time being, on every fact which cannot be made to fit neatly in, however certain and obvious, which is very wonderful, although characteristic of all extreme theorists. For example, in his first “source” of crime, “particular organs being too large, and *spontaneously* too active”—it never seems to occur to him that, at least, another source of crime—and a more real, because more ultimate source—may be the too great activity of an “organ” which was *not* spontaneous, but which was voluntarily roused, and thereafter deliberately encouraged. So of his second cause—“great excitement produced by *external* causes,” he forgets that “great excitement” may be produced by causes *not* external but *internal*, to the stimulants administered by a combination of the other faculties voluntarily directed, so as to supply them. Again, it never occurs to him, that even in the case of the excitement really coming from external causes, the criminal is frequently responsible for having voluntarily exposed himself to their influence—perhaps that he failed to avoid them, perhaps that he actually sought them. Again, he forgets that even in the extreme cases in which evil passions or propensities do exercise a power which is almost uncontrollable, this power is generally an acquired one—acquired through a long course of criminal indulgence and wilful cherishing. If these indisputable facts of mental science are incompatible with the phrenological system, it would only prove, that that system is false: if they are beyond the sphere of its cognizance, it would prove that that system is

incomplete. But the truth is, that these facts are not only perfectly compatible with those which phrenology undertakes to prove, but, if we are to believe Mr. Combe, in other portions of his book, are facts on which phrenology has cast a new and original light. We cannot allow, indeed, that this science has made it more certain than it was before, that mental capacities, naturally weak, may be strengthened by exercise and legitimate use, or that others naturally over-strong, may be repressed by voluntary discipline: but it is, at least, satisfactory to know, that in Mr. Combe’s opinion, phrenology has revealed to us the very mode in which these ends are accomplished. He tells us—

“The brain partakes of the general qualities of the organized system, and is strengthened by the same means as the other organs. When the muscles are called into vivacious activity, an increased influx of blood and of nervous stimulus takes place in them, and these vessels and fibres become at once larger, firmer, and more susceptible of action. Thought and feeling are to the brain what bodily exercise is to the muscles.”

When Mr. Combe, therefore, draws up a definition of the sources of crime, which excludes all consideration of the existence of a responsible will, it is not that he is ignorant of its commanding influence over the elements of character, and the results of conduct, for he traces this influence to the operation of a physiological law: but it simply is, that this is an inconvenient fact—inconsistent with the position he is maintaining at the time. The facility with which he narrows his field of view, so as to leave outside of it everything which it is troublesome to include—everything which does not fit easily into the plan of his definitions—is one of the characteristics of the book. The orbits of the heavenly bodies are modified and altered by the attraction of surrounding spheres: but there is nothing of which the theories of Mr. Combe shew such an absolute independence as the disturbing influence of an adjacent truth.

We do not mean to accuse Mr. Combe of any conscious dishonesty of argument. There is no artifice whatever. It is merely the common error of extreme enthusiasts, that of dealing in half truths:—so easily convertible, as every one knows, into whole untruths. His errors are those of a class: and are inseparable from that idolatry of the physical sciences which places a disproportionate value on their truths, as compared with the higher truths which lie beyond. Passing from morals to religion, in so far as Mr. Combe incidentally refers to it, we

shall find the same tendencies of opinion. On one point, indeed, of no small importance, it seems to us that he makes himself out more at variance with received doctrines than he really is. The corruption of human nature is an idea to which he never refers, except in terms of somewhat scornful rejection. Yet every page of his own writings is one continued groan over the manifold evils which man has brought, and is bringing on himself, by wilful violations of every natural law—not always through simple ignorance, but on the contrary, very often with knowledge ample enough to have required from him more complete obedience. He does, indeed, express his hope, that through the blessings of that new philosophy, whose foundation-stone is a knowledge of the mind's physical "organs," man may yet be found in harmony with himself. But when we turn to his own descriptions of what that "self" has hitherto been, this hope turns out to be but a sorry consolation. He says—

"In all ages, practical men have dedicated three-fourths of their time to pursuits calculated to gratify the faculties which bear reference to this world alone: but, unfortunately, the remaining fourth has not been devoted to objects related to their higher powers. Ambition has not been directed exclusively to moral objects, but, generally, the reverse. The hours which should have been dedicated to the improvement of their higher faculties have been either devoted to the pursuit of gain, sensual pleasure, or the objects of a vulgar ambition, or spent in mere trifling amusements or relaxations."

Then, has not Mr. Combe to deplore that even now the truths of his phrenological "philosophy of mind" are habitually disregarded, even those of them which are generally admitted? It is as difficult to place Mr. Combe in "harmony" with himself, as it is to effect this object, in reference to mankind in general, until we discover that he does admit "corruption" in a certain sense, telling us that it "consists in man's tendency to abuse his faculties." For our own part, we are satisfied with this:—An universal tendency to abuse his faculties, visible, more or less, in all men, and in all ages, from the first moment of his will being able to show itself,—is as much on this head as can be required by the most zealous divine. That *kind* and *degree* of corruption which is involved in the subjection of man's nature to the excesses of separate impulsive "organs," without a Will to guide them, is no part of the Christian system, but belongs exclusively to the "philosophy" of Mr. Combe.

There is a whole chapter devoted to the

"relation between science and scripture," a subject on which the author tells us that he enters rather for the sake of the interest of the subject, than from any feeling of the necessity of a defence. There is a great deal of what we may call the Galileo class of argument in this chapter, which we have no inclination to dispute; and a long array of the cases, certainly numerous enough, in which the bigotry and ignorance of ecclesiastics and religious parties have opposed and impeded the investigation of scientific truth. But unfortunately Mr. Combe, by the manner in which he handles the subject, does much to aggravate the evil. He must remember that though it is the height of folly to oppose religious to scientific truth—or to be jealous of any fact which our faculties enable us to ascertain, it is by no means foolish but very wise, to be exceedingly jealous of the use which may be made of such facts by that strange Being who, as Mr. Combe admits, exhibits an inveterate "tendency" to the abuse of his faculties. He must also remember that each particular class of mind, and each particular exercise of the faculties, is connected with a tendency to some particular abuse; and that one besetting danger of those who have an active inquiring intellect, much engaged in the search after secondary causes, is to over-estimate the relative value of the little which their knowledge has revealed, as compared with the truths, vast and infinite, which their ignorance conceals. Whenever, then, the facts of science are made the subject of this abuse—when such men look on their "Philosophy" as embracing a very much larger circle than it really does, and are therefore perpetually "intruding into the things which they have not seen" by presumptuous conclusions from what they do see, they are serving the cause of bigotry and ignorance, by exhibiting as the result of science, what is nothing but the result of their own infirmities. Now we cannot be surprised to find that a writer who, even within the legitimate circle of his own investigations, groups together so unskillfully the facts with which he has to deal, and seems incapable of keeping in mind more than a few even of these at any one time—who regards phrenology as the basis of the philosophy of mind, instead of the philosophy of mind as the basis of phrenological observation—and who omits from among the sources of crime, that one source apart from which it ceases to be a crime at all—is still less capable of estimating fairly the great truths which lie beyond the boundary of his own science; or that when he treats of these at all, he does so in a light which is not their

own. Accordingly, his arguments continually tend to explain away all those spiritual influences which are more specially the subjects of religious faith, and which do not easily come under the explanations of the phrenological philosophy of mind. Although the existence of such internal influences is among the deepest intuitions of the human spirit, as well as emphatically declared in Revelation, Mr. Combe surmounts every difficulty by reminding us, that "all existing interpretations of Scripture" have been made by men who were ignorant of phrenology; and as this is, in his opinion, the "most comple system of mental philosophy which has hitherto been taught," he naturally is disposed to doubt any mental phenomena which that system finds it difficult to include. Thus, where the doctrine of God's direct influence on the soul is referred to, Mr. Combe seeks for some form in which he can reconcile it with his own notion of the brain's inalienable functions, and exclude the idea of any external interference: declaring "his inference that the Divine Spirit, mentioned in Scripture as a power of influencing the human mind, invariably acts in harmony with the laws of organization." Now this *may* bear a meaning to which no serious objection can be made. Undoubtedly, if God acts on the human spirit, he must have given it faculties and dispositions on which that action can be made to operate. But if no more than this be the import of Mr. Combe's "inference," would he have thought it worth while to express it? Is not the idea he intends to convey something of this sort: that the power of operation on the human mind, by the Divine Spirit, is strictly limited by the "size and activity" of the cerebral organs with which each man is born? And do we not see in this position—only carried into a higher department of truth—that same narrowness of vision which could not combine into one view the existence of separate faculties, and the existence also of an independent will gifted with the power of regulation and control? We have seen that within the limits of the mind itself, he so merged the ruling authority, and exalted the mere force of individual "organs," that the criminal was considered a mere passive agent in their hands; and it is therefore quite natural that outside, as it were, the limits of the mind, he should have great difficulty in admitting the ordinary operation of a power to restore, strengthen, and direct the will. The same tendencies of opinion are apparent in every one of the numerous points in which Mr. Combe's subject leads him to the borders or beyond the borders of

religious truth. When, for example, Mr. Combe tells us that the sermons of the last century were generally "equal, if not superior, in sense and suitableness to human nature, to those delivered yesterday"—when he looks forward to the time when "Divines shall introduce the natural laws into their discourses, and teach the people the works and institutions of the Creator"—when speaking still more positively he refers to the ignorance which has so long "represented Christianity as a system of spiritual influences, of internal operations on the soul, and of repentant preparation for another life; rather than an exposition of pure and lofty principles addressed to responding faculties in human nature itself, and, therefore, capable of being applied in this world"—and again, when he speaks of religious discourses often, partaking, in consequence of the abstractedness of the scholastic philosophy"—we see the same habit of misplacing or exaggerating a few subordinate truths, at the expense of others far more important, either forgotten or denied. If it be simply meant that every fact discovered by science, and every law traced in nature, are to be viewed in a religious light, and referred directly to the will of God, we accept the principle with cordial assent. But if it be meant, as it too plainly is, that these can be made in themselves the objects of a religious faith, more capable either of influencing human motive, or satisfying the human spirit, than that system of spiritual beliefs which Mr. Combe seems to think so erroneous a representation of Christianity—we can only wonder at the credulity which hopes so much from the force of logic, and at the blindness which fears so little the effect of passion, and has observed so little of the power of faith. The moral essays, for example, of the last century, whatever Mr. Combe may think of their superior "sense and suitability to human nature," had, *as a fact*, infinitely less practical effect on character than the more spiritual discourses of the present time. No law, among material things, has its existence more thoroughly ascertained, or its effects more frequently observed than that which constitutes our belief in spiritual things, by far the most powerful spring of human action: and where those things have not been revealed, there they have been imagined. But without any belief in a class of truths which reason may confirm, but cannot of itself discover, no race of human beings has yet been found existing; nor is any influence on life and conduct so subtle and pervading. It is a principle of mental science, which even Mr. Combe's philosophy admits, that every fa-

culty and desire "stands in a definite relation to some external object."*

So we presume that answering to this universal sentiment of belief in things unseen and spiritual, there *are* spiritual realities, to which reason cannot of itself attain, but which all men have yet an intense desire to know. If we grant, then, as Mr. Combe never disputes, that the Christian revelation of those realities is a true one, it follows that the teaching of *them* must be the only effective basis of that corresponding moral code, whose surpassing excellence he frequently admits; and it is an inversion of the order of nature, and of the observed law of sequence, to suppose that the abstract principles of morality can ever in themselves be made to occupy the place or exercise the influence of a religious faith in these realities. Still more unphilosophical and at variance with all experience, is it to suppose that this place and rank can ever be assumed by the knowledge acquired in the investigation of the natural laws. From these we can, indeed, infer by reasoning some general ideas of the Creator—of his "eternal power and Godhead," of His goodness, and of His justice. But such general conclusions are in themselves too abstract, and fall too far short of satisfying the affections, to exert any permanent influence on the human spirit, or become the object of a vital personal belief. Very different, however, is the value of the natural laws, when they are regarded as the works of a Creator, whose revealed character and government has been previously believed and known. Then, indeed, will the light which they are capable of yielding in their endless variety yet close connexion—in their types and analogies—be enjoyed and understood. Recognition is easy where original discovery would have been impossible. There is no science which supersedes the question which David asked—"Who by searching can find out God?" although every one of them may add new meaning and illustration to the character He has revealed. When, therefore, Mr. Combe objects to the spiritual doctrines of the Christian Faith, as parts of religion which have exclusive reference to a future life, and when he points to the investigation of the natural laws, physical and moral, as the true basis of a practical religion, he is exhibiting almost incredible blindness to a fundamental principle in the "Constitution of Man." We do not now condemn this teaching on any higher ground than one purely philosophical, having for its basis the

observed phenomena of mind, as exhibited in every age and country. But we are bound to say in passing, that the language of Mr. Combe, in pushing back, as it were, the more spiritual doctrines of Christianity, from the foreground of its teaching, as having remote effect on the practical affairs of this life, requires such dealing with frequent and emphatic declarations of Scripture, as cannot be fairly called a mere various interpretation. And if this be so, he cannot be surprised, that his book is often connected with opinions which carry this postponement of the spiritual beliefs of the Christian Faith, much farther than possibly he himself may be disposed to do. The disposition he evinces, as we have seen, not merely to postpone, but to explain away such of them as cannot be easily reduced under his phrenological formulas of the spontaneous action of individual "organs," is the very spirit which rouses against the natural sciences, those jealousies which are, indeed, most irrational as directed against any class of truths, but which are too often thoroughly justified as against the fanaticism and presumption of those who can see nothing beyond the narrow bounds of some favourite pursuit.

Mr. Combe's enthusiasm in the cause of phrenology, and the simplicity of his belief in the unbounded blessings it may yet confer upon the world, is only displeasing where it crosses into sacred ground, and occupies a territory which belongs to truths much higher than any on which his theories are built. Very often we can follow with some instruction, and still more often with real pleasure and amusement, the footsteps of a mind possessed by many useful and practical ideas, and whose benevolence is conspicuous even in its widest deviations. Who would not wish to be initiated into the happy brotherhood of which Mr. Combe gives us the following picture:—

"A party of thoroughly practical phrenologists meet in the perfect knowledge of each other's qualities: they respect these as the gift of the Creator; and their great object is to derive the utmost pleasure from their legitimate use, and to avoid every approximation to abuse of them. The distinctions of country and education are broken down by unity of principle: the chilling restraints of cautiousness, self-esteem, secretiveness, and love of approbation, which stand as barriers of eternal ice between human beings in the ordinary intercourse of society, are gently removed; the directing sway is committed to benevolence, veneration, conscientiousness, and intellect; and, then, the higher principles of the mind operate with a delightful vivacity unknown to persons unacquainted with the qualities of human nature!"

* Mr. Combe says "*almost*" every faculty stands, &c. He surely cannot mean that any of the highest faculties of all are an exception to this law.

Who would not be a thoroughly practical phrenologist? But, by the way it occurs to us to ask Mr. Combe who it is, or what it is, that "commits the directing sway" as above described? Is it a faculty of will? If it be, how is this itself directed?

We have left ourselves little space to refer, in any detail, to those portions of the "Constitution of Man," in which we can follow the writer with positive assent. It is the less needful, however, to do so, as the truths which Mr. Combe enforces, are such as are generally admitted, but yet do not the less require to be frequently and emphatically repeated. The plan of the work is simple—being an exposition of the relation in which we stand to the natural laws, which fall under the great leading divisions of physical, organic, and moral. The principle that these have all a separate and independent operation, so that obedience to the one class of laws will not obviate the punishment, or evil consequences involved in the violation of another class—is announced as "the key to the true theory of the divine government of the world," and as having not been hitherto duly appreciated. The farther principle that all these natural laws are expressions of the Creator's will, and, therefore, to be investigated and obeyed as such, is one frequently enforced, as it cannot be enforced too much. All the leading and best ideas in the chapters treating of the moral laws, as, indeed, of the other natural laws also, are derived from the noble work of Bishop Butler—that great pioneer in a path of investigation which will never cease to afford interest and instruction to the highest faculties of man. The obligation is most fully and honourably acknowledged. In the sections devoted to the organic laws, a subject which has been handled with such eminent utility by the author's brother, the late Dr. Andrew Combe, there is much curious and interesting information. Here, however, as elsewhere, the relative value of individual truths is sometimes so much forgotten that the result arrived at is most erroneous. For example, on the important subject of the laws of health which regulate the transmission of a sound bodily and mental constitution to our children—no one will dispute that these, so far as they can be ascertained, ought to be borne in mind, and ought to influence our conduct in determining the circumstances of the marriage union. But the mere physiologist forgets that there are other considerations to be kept in view than the improvement of the race considered as a breed. And even in this narrow, though important point of view, nothing can be more unguarded than to lay down as Mr.

Combe does, by quotation and adoption from an American writer, that all "persons in any way constitutionally enfeebled—persons predisposed to scrofula, pulmonary consumption, gout, or epilepsy, should conscientiously abstain from matrimony." A very large proportion of the population of the civilized world have some predisposition more or less distant, more or less decided, to some one or other of such diseases. Without adverting to other laws which may determine the path of duty in an opposite direction to that laid down here, it is enough to observe that the highest benefits to mankind may be, and have been derived through the agency of persons labouring under constitutional taints of every variety and kind. Nay, it is a matter of familiar observation that the highest gifts of genius, the noblest dispositions, and the utmost holiness and purity of spirit, are constantly associated with physical frames hasting to premature decay. Among the number of poets and philosophers who have delighted and instructed the world, how many names occur to us of men whose bodily infirmities were as remarkable as their mental gifts! And in the circle of our own private acquaintance, how many are there under similar circumstances whose character has been eminently fine and their influence eminently beneficial?

In the section devoted to calamities arising from infringement of the moral law, considered in reference to the welfare of individuals and the general progress of society, Mr. Combe makes many interesting observations, and lays down many wholesome principles. Of the many great evils of our existing social system, as the result of a too exclusive pursuit of material wealth—of the want of all leisure for moral and intellectual improvement left to thousands of the manufacturing operative class—and of the punishment by which the natural laws of God will in the end vindicate their own authority—there are strong and useful representations. Nor can we withhold the expression of our sympathy and assent from many of the views expressed as to the direction which our efforts should take for the counteraction of these evils. The time saved by the rapid progress of mechanical invention, involving as it does, some temporary evils, is justly regarded by the author as a fund out of which increased opportunities for the mental cultivation of the working-classes may, if duly improved, be reconciled with the rapidly increasing wants of society. And as regards the part which may be taken by legislation towards the attainment of these great ends, Mr. Combe, we think, takes his stand on the true principle when he says, "that the Leg-

islature may considerably accelerate improvements by adding the constraining authority of human laws to enactments already proclaimed by the Creator." This, at least, is one form of expressing the true answer to the extreme economists, who deny that law ought ever to interfere in any case with the province of industry, and who consider such evils as the absolute neglect of a whole generation of the young, and the total abandonment of them to the debasing effect of excessive and unremitting toil, as nothing compared with the slightest check on the accumulations of the warehouse. It is very true that there are natural laws in operation which will tend to counteract all evils—but that counteraction will be in the form of tremendous punishment; and assuredly none more severe or sweeping will attend the infraction of any law of God, than those which must in the end overtake the community which gives itself up to the exclusive pursuit of wealth, and deliberately refuses such self-restraint as may reconcile the duty of labour with the higher duty of religious and moral culture.

In conclusion, we should say of this work, that its great fault lies, as is very commonly the case, in that which the author thinks its peculiar merit. He says, that it contains no new truths, but that, in the relation in which admitted truths stand to each other, he thinks his ideas are new and important. We should say, on the contrary, that his book is full of single truths, not certainly new, yet requiring to be impressed and often put with ingenuity and force; but that the relation in which these truths stand to each other, and to other truths which are kept out of view, is essentially erroneous. As regards the bearing of this work on the interests of religion, we have said enough to indicate our opinion. Mr. Combe is justified in saying, that the practical results he teaches are in general harmony with the *moral precepts* of the New Testament. It is likewise true that he takes pleasure in pointing out this harmony to his readers. Nay more: those who look with attention to the natural laws which he expounds, will not fail to be struck with new instances of that pervading analogy which obtains between the principles of divine government involved in the spiritual doctrines of Christianity, and those which are even now seen in active operation in this present world. But such harmonies as these, the reader must be prepared to discover for himself. He will often find spiritual beliefs brought down as it were under some form of physical "explanation;" but never any law of the material world traced upward to its spiritual meaning. We do not forget

that Mr. Combe's purpose in investigating the natural laws, is different from that of the theologian in dealing with the same subject. He professes to confine himself to "Man as he exists in this world," and may fairly decline to pursue any line of thought beyond the bounds of its visible horizon. But, even supposing this limit to be faithfully adhered to, infinite errors on what lies beyond this world may be involved in our description of what goes on within it. Of old the earth was regarded as itself the centre of a system, and the heavenly bodies as moving round it. Even when there was no direct reference to this erroneous theory of the nature of celestial objects, it imparted a false light or colouring to every idea of terrestrial things. And, as in the physical world all just conception of the phenomena of our planet depends on a knowledge of the relative position and magnitude of the great bodies amongst which it moves; so, in the moral world, does everything depend on a right understanding of the great spiritual truths which extend beyond the boundaries of time. It is very easy, in giving an account of the different climates of the globe, and of the variations of the seasons, to convey the most monstrous errors on the science of astronomy; and it is not less easy in constructing a "Philosophy of the human mind," to assail the first elements of moral and religious truth. Such, in our opinion, must be the effect of doctrines tending to deny or explain away, in ethical science, the free will and responsibility of man; and, in religion, those external spiritual influences on human character which are a fundamental part of the Christian faith, but which, of course, cannot be made sensible to the fingers of the phrenologist. Observing, as we do with pleasure, some individual passages which indicate a glimpse of higher views, we must condemn the general tendency of Mr. Combe's system, as hostile to the reception of these essential truths. Does the Christian rejoice in a belief and consciousness of a personal change effected and maintained through help of the Divine Spirit holding intercourse with his own?—Mr. Combe admits, with that air of patronage which belongs to superior knowledge, that such a person "labours under great disadvantages from their ignorance of the functions of the brain and of the laws of its activity," and then proceeds to explain to him that he is not "aware of the extent to which a large development of the moral organs, combined with an active temperament, contribute to such effects!" Or again,—fortified as he is on this as on the other belief, by the most express declarations of Scripture, does he

believe in the power of prayer to affect the issue of events?—Mr. Combe tells him that the (only ?) use of prayer is to be found in its influence on his own mind. Now that prayer, when believed in as regards its *outward aim*, has a reflex influence on the character of him who prays, is indeed most true. Whether it would continue to have that influence, if *no other* were believed in—whether we *could* pray, knowing that to petition God is but a form—fallacious and yet wholesome—of preaching to ourselves, we leave Mr. Combe's "philosophy of mind" to settle as it can.

That our author does not see all the consequences of his own principles, nay, that he himself admits truths which ought to have given more elevation, and a wider grasp to his philosophy, we are very willing to admit: whilst his evident sincerity and benevolence must leave on the minds of his readers many pleasing impressions. But truth compels us to condemn the general tendency of his "philosophy," on grounds which we trust we have sufficiently explained. Our conclusion, however, is not that which Mr. Combe so often assumes as the necessary resort of his adversaries. We do not dread Phrenology in itself: we see no "danger" in this or in any other of the natural sciences, except that danger which belongs to every pursuit, arising from the faults of the inquirer. But against these the best security is to be found in a wider diffusion of the knowledge and of the love of science: that its facts may be brought into contact with many minds: and so their true place and bearing may be more quickly ascertained. The division of labour is a principle applicable not less to the labour of the intellect than to the labour of the hands. Mr. Combe belongs to a class of writers who are of great use in the ascertainment or illustration of separate facts, but whose views of their relation to each other, and to higher departments of truth, can be seldom trusted. They who make the parts of a machine are not generally those who can construct the whole; and, in like manner, those who are engrossed in the discovery, or in the contemplation of single truths, are often incapable of assigning them their proper place in the general system of human knowledge. The danger of such "philosophies of mind" as that we have been examining, must be met and not evaded. It cannot be done either by discouraging scientific inquiries, or by proclaiming an absolute separation between the things which belong to reason and those which belong to faith. Every outward form has an inward meaning,—a relation real, though often obscure, to the things which

are unseen and eternal. Where the true meaning is not found, some false or illusory meaning will be imagined. As surely as the organic frame assimilates to itself every variety of substance which enters into the composition of its food, so surely will the human mind, after its own spiritual nature, assimilate every appearance of the visible creation. "Who shall read the interpretation thereof" is written on everything we see, and carried in every sound we hear. To interpret nature rightly and to harmonize its material facts with those of the spiritual world, is one of the great works to be attended to in our day.

ART. III.—1. *Passages in the Life of Gilbert Arnold; or, The Tale of the Four Sermons.* By SULLIVAN EARLE. London, 1852.

2. *Companions of my Solitude.* By the Author of "Friends in Council." London, 1851.

ALTHOUGH we may not very cordially admire the specimen which he has given us of the works which he would see written for their amusement and instruction, we cordially agree with Lamartine in all that he has said about the importance of writing books for the poor. To write books for the highly educated classes is comparatively a small matter. It is *something*, we admit, to be known and appreciated in the salons of Belgravia, and the banqueting-rooms of May Fair—something, to be read by lords and ladies and men of genius and celebrity—something, to be commended by quarterly reviewers and cited by members of parliament—to be in demand at metropolitan circulating libraries, and to be sure of a place in the "trellised cages," which contain the literary wealth of the lordly magnates of our Woburns and Chatsworths. But, rightly understood, it is a far greater privilege to be a welcome guest in the cottage homes of our teeming England. The "fit audience though few" is not to be greatly desired. They who write for what is ordinarily called *fame*, must write for the critics who are its dispensers. To write for the poor is commonly to place one's-self beneath the notice of the critics. It is neither to make money nor to make a name. And so it happens that when benevolent people look about them for books to place in the hands of their poorer neighbours—books that will at once interest and instruct them, they find marvellously few

suit to the purpose. It is a common complaint, in our country, as in Lamartine's, that there are "no good books for the poor."

And this complaint is not uttered so much because there is a scarcity of this kind of book, as because these books are not good of their kind. Many books have been written, of late years, expressly for the poor—and, more particularly for the children of the poor; but they have for the most part either wanted something which they ought to contain, or contained something which they ought to want. A considerable number of the simple stories of village life, recently published in England, have been written by people obviously well acquainted with the feelings and habits of our rural population. These stories are interesting, and up to a certain point instructive. There is, indeed, a great deal of very excellent morality in them, and the moral teaching is conveyed through a channel which renders it extremely palatable to the young. Altogether, the cleverness and tact displayed in these volumes—the simple and agreeable style—the natural character of the incidents and personages introduced, and the obvious kindness and seeming good intentions of the writers, prepossess one strongly in favour of the volumes of which we speak. Indeed, the unprepared reader not improbably, after perusing a few pleasant chapters, begins to think that he has found what he has long been in search of, a good book for the poor; but suddenly he pauses, lifts his eyes from the page; a painful doubt has obtruded itself; he begins to think that the volume which was so delighting him, has got a *taint* about it after all. It is but a brief sentence—perhaps only a word that has arrested him. But the experienced reader knows what that word indicates. He knows that, however insidiously conveyed—however adroitly concealed, the poison is there. He reads on, and he doubts no longer. Doubts have given place to disappointment. The feeling is a more positive and active one. He finds that he has been reading with interest and attention—that he had very nearly placed in the hands of his children or his poor dependents, a book rendered doubly dangerous by the disguise in which its mischief is enveloped. He finds, in a word, that the author is an insidious tractarian, and that there is a leaven of false doctrine in the book, for which no knowledge of the subject illustrated, no cleverness of treatment, no attractiveness of style can compensate. There is a ceremonial Christianity insinuated in its pages—an exaltation of the prayer-book, the church catechism, the sacraments, indeed, of

the very brick and mortar of the church, at the expense of spiritual religion. There is altogether a distressing formalism in them very destructive of the pure and simple faith—the leaning upon the merits of the Redeemer—which has been emphatically called the "religion of the poor."

We have many books of this class before us to which especial reference might be made in illustration of these remarks. They are books obviously written, as we say, by people well acquainted with the habits and feelings of the poor in our English villages, and their appearance is one of many indications not only of the insidious activity of the party from whom they emanate, but of the intelligence which directs its movements. Whilst one section of this party is preparing, in divers ways, strong food for adult minds, another is supplying milk for babes and sucklings. Wise in their generation, they perceive how great a thing it is to habituate the minds of the young even to certain forms of expression, a familiarity which is often more fatal to a right conception of the truth than more direct and emphatic teaching. Open questions are here insinuated as settled points of doctrine; and the childish confidence and unsuspiciousness of the reader are turned to account in a manner which exhibits, clearly enough to those who have eyes to see beneath the surface, the subtlety and ingenuity of the writer. Of this class of books the best are perhaps, the "Stories for Youth and Childhood," extracted from the "Magazine for the Young;" and "Langley School," by writers of the same stamp, if not the same writers—in both of which there are some very clever and truthful illustrations of village life. In another walk of literature especial mention may be made of the "Child's Book of Ballads," by the Author of "Hymns and Scenes of Childhood," which contains some very graceful and touching poetry, but with vastly too much in it about baptismal regeneration and the ministration of angels. Nor is it only in the realms of poetry and romance that these writers have displayed their activity. They have insinuated their peculiar doctrines into the pages of sober history, and written very pretty class-books for young people in which the blessed reformers of our religion are very scurvily treated, and "Charles the Martyr" canonized as a saint. The worst of it is that all these books are so cleverly written, and in all but the one point, answer so nearly the conditions required in works intended for the instruction of the young, that heads of families who have often time to do little more than glance at the books which they purchase for their children and

dependents, are likely to fall into the trap that is laid for them, and to carry home the poison in their pockets. For our own part we can but greatly deplore the misdirection of so much good talent. "The pity of it, Oh, Iago! The pity of it."

But we have only now to speak of those works which treat especially of the condition of our rural population, or are intended especially for the perusal of the poor. From many of the tales to which we have alluded, there is, we repeat, to be derived a very clear impression of some aspects of village life. Apart, however, from their Tractarian tendencies, there is a manifest defect in the majority of them. The man has painted the picture, and he has painted the lion undermost. The failings of the poor are illustrated very truthfully and minutely, and their duties to one another, and to their richer neighbours, are set forth with sufficient distinctness. But the general inference to be drawn from them is, that the rich are continually doing their duty, and that the poor are continually failing in theirs. Now, it appears to us, that if the rich would only do their duty with a little more conscientiousness, they would not have to tell so many stories of the miserable errors of the poor.

There are two kinds of books which may be written for the benefit of the poor; those which teach the poor their own duties, and those which teach the rich their duties towards them. It were not unworthy of the highest order of intelligence to write either the one or the other. If the two objects can be attained at the same time, so much the better. Hitherto the two subjects have been treated distinctly, and by very much the same class of writers. The Tractarian writers have been almost as busy in one direction as the other. They write very cleverly—and very craftily—on these subjects; and diffuse the well-disguised poison among all classes of their unsuspecting brethren. The authoress of *Amy Herbert* is, perhaps, the most remarkable of these writers. But we know no book of the kind more to be grieved over than *Brampton Rectory*; it is so almost good. It is the ordinary course of procedure with these writers to bring into a neglected parish, an earnest, energetic minister of the Tractarian school, intent on doing a great deal of good, in his own way; and, doubtless, doing some good in a way to which no reasonable Christian can object. He is active, which is good—he is clever, which is good—he is earnest, which is good—he is kindly, which is good—he is charitable, which is good—and in all these things he necessarily carries with him the sympathies of the reader.

He interests himself deeply in the affairs of the parish—he makes the personal acquaintance of the parishioners—he improves the village schools—he does many things which, as a Christian minister, it unquestionably behoves him to do; but, then, it appears in time, that he is a Christian minister of the new school, which places the Church before the Gospel, and believes in the efficacy of ceremonial signs. He has not been long in the parish before he bethinks himself of "restoring" the old church, and pulling down the old pews. He has great faith in certain forms of brick and mortar, and shapes of carved wood. Then he introduces new modes of church music. He sweeps the old village orchestra clean out of the gallery, and he gets together the most promising boys and girls of the village to teach them to chant the church service, and bungle through a so-called "anthem." He institutes a daily service at the expense of family-worship. Then he talks a great deal about the baptismal sign, and the "holy little children" that are made by the sprinkling of water—about the reverence due to the Church, and the great lessons taught in the Prayer-Book; but about the great fundamental truths of vital Christianity we find little in these books. The faith which is spoken of is faith in signs, and forms, and ceremonies, not faith in the atonement itself.

It would seem to be the object of the author of the "Tale of the Four Sermons" to do that for evangelical Protestantism which others have done for the religion which borders more nearly upon the Church of Rome. Mr. Sullivan Earle has given, in imitation of the Tractarian writers, a sketch of a model clergyman, with all the earnestness and activity of the pet parsons of the other school, but with no peculiar attachment to any set forms of truth and justice, or any especial faith in the efficacy of signs and ceremonies. Prayer to God—not through the intervention of the Church, but ascending from the heart of man right to the mercy-seat of God, and faith in the redeeming power of the blood of the Lamb—not in the baptismal cross and the eucharistic emblems—are the means by which, in this story, all things are accomplished. But it is not in this aspect that we desire to regard the "Four Sermons," but simply as a story of village life—one in which many important matters affecting the welfare of our rural communities are glanced at, or perhaps illustrated in the course of the narrative. It is plainly the work of one who has seen much of what he describes, and seems to have a three-fold object; for it illustrates, in the history of a prodigal son, who brings the gray hairs of his sainted father in sorrow

to the grave, but tries to wash his own garments white in the blood of the Lamb, the efficacy of prayer, "the effectual fervent prayer of the righteous man;" it illustrates also, the efficacy of earnest preaching—of a warm, loving, gospel ministry, preaching forgiveness of sins; and it sets forth the duties of the rich towards the poor, and shows how much may be done by kindly intercourse between them, to raise the social and religious character of our English villages. The other volume which we have taken as our second text-book, is very different in external design from the first; but is written with kindred feeling. The two writers have obviously much in common with each other. They are working towards the same common end. In the colloquial essays, which are the vehicles of the opinions of the thoughtful author of *Companions of my Solitude*, there is much which might be placed side by side with the descriptive sketches of the Easter story.* But it is only so far as they relate to the aspects of village life in England, and especially to the relations subsisting between the rich and the poor, that we have anything to do either with the one work or the other.

The crying want of the times, is a want of frequent communication between the rich and the poor. Every rich man—we mean by these words, every man or woman of rank and education superior to those of the so-called "labouring classes"—may do an infinite deal of good by keeping up a kindly intercourse with his poorer neighbours. Women have, in this matter, greater facilities than men. They have, ordinarily, more time at their disposal; and they can visit where men can not. Indeed, during the greater part of the day—perhaps, the whole of that portion of the day which is ordinarily at the disposal of our gentry for such purposes, the working man is away from his home. His wife and children are always to be found. The facilities of intercourse between rich and poor women are, therefore, tenfold greater than between rich and poor men. The working men are often little better than myths, when their wives and children are familiar realities. You may, indeed, be intimately acquainted with all the members of a village family, down to the very baby, before you know the father even by sight. Our main reliance, therefore, as the actual channel of communication, must be upon our English ladies. But, although theirs is the hand that yields the sea-

sonable assistance, and the tongue that utters the timely word of sympathy and consolation, it is the man whose duty it is to supply the one and to prompt the other; and whose earnestness or lukewarmness in the good cause, generally—not always, perhaps—regulates the amount of activity apparent in the well-doing of his wife or daughter.

Nor is it much to be regretted, that the direct intercourse should be mainly between the gentler members of the two classes. There is less reserve between women; and women are infinitely more docile. We might, indeed, be almost content to leave our working men to themselves—and, indeed, they are very much left to themselves—if we could only bring the women into frequent communication with the gentlewomen of our rural districts. There is nothing more demoralizing than a slovenly home. Domestic discomfort, after a day's work, sends a man to the bright fire and clean sanded floor of the village ale-house. It is of little use to rail at him, and say that he is a bad father and a brutal husband. We do the same thing ourselves—only in a finer way, and with less excuse for it. Domestic discomfort of a far less vexatious and intolerable character, drives gentlemen to their gorgeous club-houses, and induces them to accept bachelor invitations, which, if home were sufficiently attractive to retain them, would be impatiently rejected. We cannot expect a man, who has been toiling from early morning, not to look for some comfort and pleasure when the day's work is done. If he cannot find it at home, he will go abroad in search of it; so his money is wasted, his character is demoralized. His wife is neglected—his children are starved. Everything goes wrong. The evil perpetuates itself. The house becomes more untidy; the wife more querulous; the children more troublesome. The man and all his family are ruined; when a little more thought, and very little more labour, on the part of the wife, might have saved them all from destruction, by securing them a comfortable home.

This has been said very often before; but it is one of those commonplaces which cannot be too often repeated, if it were only to indicate the incalculable benefit resulting from frequent intercourse between the rich and the poor. If the gentlewomen of our rural districts were in the frequent habit of visiting the village homes of the working classes, there would be fewer untidy cottages, and fewer disorderly families—there would be altogether more domestic cleanliness and regularity, and, therefore, more domestic happiness. It will not often happen, that

* The peculiar application of the story to Easter is, that it is an illustration in the career of Gilbert Arnold, of "a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness."

the lady-visitor will be compelled to say much on the subject. In most cases the visit often repeated, will have all the desired effect. The cottage will be more cleanly; the children will be more tidy and better disciplined; everything will be more in its proper place. There is an instinctive desire in the breasts of the humbler classes, to keep up a decent appearance in the eyes of their richer neighbours. They begin, perhaps, by endeavouring to appear more cleanly and orderly than they really are, by preparing for the lady's visit, and after her departure suffering things to reassume their old aspect of untidiness and dirt. What they do, is done more from respect to their visitor, than from respect to themselves. But if these visits are frequently paid at no regularly recurring intervals, and at all hours of the day, there can be no pretence of cleanliness; spasmodic bursts of tidiness and regularity will not avail. The practice must become habitual; and the habit once formed, that which was irksome soon becomes a pleasure, and what was done in the first instance from respect to others, will soon be done from self-respect. The sympathy of the rich makes the poor think better of themselves. People who feel that they are not cared for by others, soon become careless of themselves.

Great things, indeed, are these which our gentlewomen may do. Their visits to the cottages of the poor can rarely be unattended with good results, even if there be nothing but a brief conversation on ordinary topics. But, if a more active interest be taken by the visitor in what she sees, and what she hears—if she endeavour to aid, as well as to encourage, the orderly projects of the housewife—to help her, as the rich may always help the poor at small cost to themselves, to make her home more comfortable, of course the good results are proportionably great. Now, food and clothing are, doubtless, very important matters. The body must be protected against cold and hunger. But these are not the only evils of life; and there are other things besides food and clothing, which from our over-abundant stores, we may sometimes bestow upon the poor. But we seldom think of giving them anything but these bare necessities of life, and there are many who would reproach their neighbours for “putting ideas into the heads” of the poor, (as though any head could have too many ideas), if they were to hear of any articles having been given to them, intended to contribute not so much to the sustentation, as to the embellishment of life. It would be held an act of folly, if not of something worse, to bestow any part of one's

charities in the shape of what is, primarily, only ornamental. But it is a mistake to draw a strong line of distinction between things useful and things ornamental. The ornamental is often, in the highest sense, the useful; and nowhere more so than in cottage parlours. The eye has its wants, no less than the back and the stomach. Some small article of furniture—a scrap of cheerful carpet-drugget, or of curtain-chintz—a little book-shelf with a few books to range upon it, added to at different times—a print from some work of high art, if from a scriptural subject, so much the better—or even some slight articles of crockery, making the tea-table a little gayer and brighter—are all things which may be given with advantage to the poor, for they are gifts of the reproductive class, and are sure to bear good fruit in the shape of increased household comfort and cheerfulness, and a larger stock of good temper. Women are often careless and untidy because they feel they have nothing worth taking care of. It is, doubtless, a mistake; but when they look at their bare walls and bare floors, and see the utter impossibility of extracting anything like cheerfulness out of so much barrenness and sterility, they think that they may leave things to themselves, for nothing can make them worse. But a clean empty room is better than a dirty one; and the less furniture there is in it the more apparent, perhaps, is the dirt. Still it is very hard to *take a pride* in bare walls and barren floors. A very well regulated mind will make the best of anything; and its possessor, if condemned to live in an empty room, will take care that it is the cleanest of empty rooms. But very well regulated minds are rare in any condition of life: and we make the greatest of all mistakes when we endeavour to exact from the poor an amount of magnanimity rarely or never to be found in the rich. If angels came to dwell in *five-pound* cottages, it would be a different matter. But as they do not, we must look at things as they are with the greatest possible amount of toleration, and not judge our poor neighbours too hardly, if they think it better worth their while to keep a nicely furnished room in good order, than one that has the desolate aspect of an empty barn.

There is no practical lesson, therefore, that we would wish to have more forcibly and frequently impressed on the English housewife, than the necessity of providing, as far as her means will permit, a comfortable home for her husband and her children. To do this, it is necessary that she should stay at home. It is hard to say anything

against the industry of the woman who goes out to work whenever she can, and makes up, by charring, harvesting, hay-making, gleanings, hopping, &c., a few stray shillings which are conveniently added to the weekly wages of the husband. But the increase of wealth derived from these sources of income is a delusion rather than a reality. The family loses more than it gains. The few shillings thus earned in the course of the year are lost twice over by the neglect of ordinary household duties, and spent twice over by the husband at the ale-house, because his wife has been out at work instead of making her house comfortable and herself clean to receive, and the tea ready to refresh him, on his return from his accustomed labour.

There are, of course, always exceptional cases. The husband may be sick, may have met with an accident, or he may be out of work; and then it may be absolutely necessary for the wife to labour abroad for the support of her family, and a very fine thing it is, too, to see the zeal and devotedness with which it is often done. But as a general rule it may be laid down that the wife is better employed at home than abroad; and that the truest thrift consists in looking well after household affairs. This is one of the things which people in a higher station, whose words are listened to as words of authority by their lowly neighbours, may profitably urge upon them. A wife has worked well and nobly, when she has done all her household duties, made her home cleanly and comfortable, and prepared herself to receive her husband on his return from the labour mart wherever it may be. At the risk of offending some people, we may add that, perhaps a little spice of coquetry—we use the word for want of a better—is very pardonable in these cases. The husband will not be more likely to betake himself to the ale-house for the consideration that his wife has been making herself, as well as her house, ready to receive him, and for the knowledge that when he reaches home, he will find her looking very fresh and clean—her hair and her dress nicely arranged, and everything about her in the best state of comeliness of which circumstances will admit. All this costs nothing. Slovenliness, indeed, is a very expensive article. They who are neatest in their persons generally spend least upon their dress. At all events, a little money well laid out will go a great way. Sixpennyworth of ribband lasts longer than sixpennyworth of ale. In all probability the man was first attracted by the comeliness of his wife, when, a young girl, she thought it worth her while to make the most of her charms. He married her

for her good looks, and he is disappointed when he finds that the neat little maiden has become the slovenly wife; that the fresh, smiling looks which so delighted him have given place to indifference and dirt.

It is difficult to over-estimate the importance of a due attention to these matters. The antidote to the ale-house is a comfortable home. If the ale-house be one of the grand causes of the demoralization of the agricultural classes, then is the comfortable home one of the most important of remedial agents. It is true that the question is not merely a moral question: we are aware that there are many material obstacles to the institution of comfortable homes. The cottages, in our rural districts, are for the most part exceedingly ill-constructed and highly rented. The poor do not obtain, in the way of house accommodation, anything like what they *ought* to obtain for their money. The cottages which they occupy are elaborately contrived for the perpetuation of the greatest possible amount of discomfort; and if with that discomfort, the elements of demoralization are not mingled, the tenant is a fortunate one. We shall speak of this more fully in another place. It is a comfort, in the meanwhile, to know that the importance of this subject of house accommodation for the poor, both in large towns and in rural districts, is very extensively recognised by men of all shades of political opinion, and that from the palace of the prince and from the garret of the neglected author, come the same solemn utterances and earnest warnings against the negligence and supineness—to say nothing of what is more sordid and repulsive—which has hitherto been so conspicuous in the manner in which we have regarded the dwelling-places of our lowly brethren. And surely it is high time, when people are making religion a question of brick and mortar, that they should make morality one also. If half as much money were spent on building improved dwelling-houses for the poor as is lavished on the reconstruction and decoration of churches already good enough for all spiritual purposes, what a deal of good might be done. We have known money to be freely offered for the former purpose, even when the parish has arrayed itself against the movement, though for any such object as the erection of dwelling-houses for the poor all the rich purses, which were so freely opened to the church-architect, would be incontinently closed. Now, in our opinion, the cottage-architect is a more important personage than the church-architect. It is doubtful whether we pray any the better for elaborate altars, and painted glass windows, and

carved seats, and costly reading-desks; but it is certain that we live much better in houses where something of comfort and something of decency may be maintained, and different members of a family are not compelled to herd together, as gregariously and almost as filthily as pigs. But we may hope that sounder opinions on this subject are steadily gaining ground, if they are not making the rapid progress which we would desire to see all truths making amongst us. In respect of rent, the poor are almost invariably overhoused. In respect of accommodation, they are as certainly under-housed. The splendid mansions of our aristocrats are cheap in comparison with the wretched hovels of the poor.

To every one who lays down a plan for the erection of labourers' cottages better calculated to promote comfort and to secure decency than those old crazy tenements which constitute a large proportion of the residences of the poor in our rural districts, we feel profoundly thankful; but we are far more thankful to those who build the cottages thus projected. We admit that the crazy old hovels, with their moss-grown thatch and their leafy walls, are very picturesque objects, and we confess that we have sometimes, in the course of an afternoon walk or ride, groaned at the first sight of some of the model cottages of red brick, which have flared upon us suddenly from unlikely rustic corners. But the first feeling of disappointment soon gives place to one of congratulation, when we come to consider how great the gain of comfort and propriety which these less picturesque dwellings present. There is no reason, indeed, why to a certain extent the useful and the ornamental should not be combined; but the real beauty of a labourer's cottage is in the interior accommodation, not in the outer walls, and we must not be particular about exterior deformities. The only wonder is, it has not occurred to benevolent people before, that, apart from the mere question of physical comfort, a very important moral question is involved in this matter of cottage accommodation; for it must be very obvious, that when different members of a family—male and female, the husband and wife, grown-up sons and daughters, perhaps an unmarried sister of either husband or wife, with younger children in all kinds of different stages—are, as frequently happens, huddled together, many in one room—all separated from each other by the slightest possible partition, if any—all feelings of maidenly modesty must be outraged in such a manner as in time habitually to blunt them. Indeed, many unfor-

tunate girls have attributed, and truthfully attributed, their ruin to this compulsory herding together in their miserable cottage homes.

And, indeed, the saddest thing of all to contemplate in connexion with village and country life, is the condition of the daughters of the poor. The kindly heart of the author of *Companions of my Solitude* has been stirred by the thought of what he calls "the great sin of great cities;" but is not the great sin of great cities also the great sin of small villages? We believe that some people have an inherited faith in the Arcadian purity and simplicity of the rural districts,—as though to be "remote from towns" were necessarily to "run a godly race." But these credulous ones, we are well assured, have either not lived in country villages at all, or they have been singularly fortunate in their choice. In the country, vice does not wear the same filthy and forbidding aspect that it wears in large towns: it is less mercenary, less systematic, less a matter of calculation; but it may be doubted whether, in proportion to the population, there is less of it.

It will be understood that we speak of that vice which peoples the stews of the great cities. How much of it is reared in the country! The town is, doubtless, the ocean into which the stream of pollution flows; but the source of it often lies in remoter rural districts. Indeed, the great sin of the town is, in no small measure, the necessary sequel of the great sin of the country. In towns it is, for the most part, a stern necessity. Vice comes there ready-made; and finds a market. It is a livelihood—nothing more—a very horrible one, felt and acknowledged to be so by the greater number of the poor outcasts who ply their wretched trade on the pavements. The door of retreat is closed against them; and they are compelled to go forward in their terrible career. The towns see the middle and the end; but they do not so often see the beginning. Men are busier than in the country; have fewer opportunities and finding so many victims ready-made, have less inducement to play the more difficult and more dangerous game of making them for themselves.

It is not our province, however, to descant upon what is done in "great cities." We are writing now of the small villages; and we return to the point from which we started to say, that there is nothing sadder to contemplate, in connexion with the subject, than the condition of the daughters of the poor. Somehow or other, large families are the rule, not the exception, in our En-

glish villages. There is always at least a fair proportion of girls—three or four in a family. What is to become of them? As soon as they are old enough to be of any use they are sent out with one or two of the younger children, mainly to clear the house. Girls of fourteen or fifteen may be seen loitering about the roads with a baby in their arms, and perhaps one or two older children dangling at their heels. One knows, at all events, what are the negative virtues of this. They are not at school—they are not improving themselves in needle-work—they are not improving themselves at all. The positive evils of all this loitering and dawdling about are equally intelligible. The amount of idle gossip and evil conversation which grows out of it is not to be calculated. These are the first-fruits. Two or three young girls—almost children—may be seen standing about together, perhaps sitting on a convenient bank or a log of wood, with their little charges on their laps, retailing, or inventing perhaps, highly-seasoned gossip—it may be about their equals; it is just as likely to be about their superiors. It runs all very much in the same channel. It relates to something or other that leads in time to the “great sin of great cities.” In their very childhood they become familiar with the name and character of almost every kind of sin. They talk of it in an easy careless manner, indeed, for the most part, with obvious pleasure, as something to be gossiped about and laughed at—not to be mourned over and condemned. This is one of the first stages of demoralization. And almost more frightful than the sin itself is the light-hearted familiarity with which it is canvassed by very young girls, and the obvious leaning towards it that is discernible in all that they say.

From gossiping with one another, they come, in a little time, to gossip with the young men. As the girl advances towards womanhood, perhaps the baby is handed over to a younger sister, or babies cease to be born in the house. Then she takes to sauntering and dawdling about the village on her own account. There is a threatening, defiant carelessness in her manner not easy to describe.* She goes about as one court-

ing destruction. It is nothing but thoughtlessness and indifference upon her part, but it is as dangerous as if it were design. She falls into conversation first with one party, then with another. She is not particular. The shades of evening descend upon the village, and find her still dawdling about. The men are returning home from their work, and there is more companionship—perhaps an assignation for a Sunday evening walk. These Sunday evenings see more mischief than all the week-days put together.* The village girl is arrayed in her comeliest costume, and the working man is washed and shaven. The former is doubly an object of temptation; the latter is less disfigured by slovenliness and dirt. But, more than this, he has his time at his own disposal. He is not wearied out with his day's work; and he turns the gracious privilege of the Sabbath to the worst possible account.

The consequences of all this sauntering and dawdling about may be conjectured. The result is not marriage. Indeed there are few things more remarkable in the sight of observant residents in many country villages than the small number of marriages solemnized in the course of the year. Among these few things, we are afraid, must be mentioned the number of illegitimate children that are born into the world. In some villages, indeed, these events are of such frequent occurrence as to excite neither surprise nor indignation. They are familiarly discussed as exciting little bits of gossip, but neither is the girl pitied nor the man condemned. It is very strange, but we believe it to be a fact, that even in cases of heartless repudiation and desertion, the

rebuke or pity. They wandered about idle and reckless, with something almost defiant in their manner, as though they were going in search of ruin,—eager to be destroyed. They had no kind of self-respect. It was more their misfortune than their fault, poor things! Nobody seemed to care for them, and so they did not care for themselves. They were indeed cast-aways before they had done wrong.”

* Many masters and mistresses thoughtlessly permit their servant-maids to enjoy a sort of half-holiday on the Sabbath, to take a country walk, or to visit, ostensibly, a distant Church. It would be far better to keep them at home, even though engaged (which is unquestionably very bad) upon their accustomed every-day duties. We would rather, indeed, see our English serving-maids dressing their masters' dinners, or curling their mistresses' hair, on a Sunday afternoon, than loitering about the fields. They are sure not to be long alone; and if they escape mischief they are fortunate. Exercise and recreation are good things for people in all conditions of life; but if masters and mistresses could only contrive to let their servant-girls go out sometimes upon week-days, it would not be thought a hardship for them to spend the Sabbath at home.

* The author of *Gilbert Arnold*, describing the state of Little Millbrook, on Mr. Arnold's advent, says, “And so it happened, that the old had become careless and negligent, and the young had grown up ignorant and immoral. When Mr. Arnold first took up his abode in the Millbrook parsonage, there was no such thing as shame known in the village; I mean that shameful things were done without any sense of shame. Young girls talked of the degradation of their companions without a word either of

sympathies of our village girls set in rather towards the offending man than towards their ruined sister. The spoiler is not shunned. Let him treat one girl as cruelly as he may, he is sure to find another to keep company with him. This has always seemed to us to be the worst feature of the case; there is something in this kind of insensibility which is very chilling and disheartening. This obtuseness of the moral sense, this deadness to shame, makes one almost despair over it. Where the standard of public opinion is so low, there is little hope of practical improvement.

In treating of "the great sin of great cities," the acute author of *Companions of my Solitude* seems to proceed upon the hypothesis that the wretched outcasts who infest the pavements of our large towns after nightfall, have usually been brought to that hopeless condition by men their superiors in birth and station; and he accounts for this very intelligibly when he says,—

"Another cause of the frailty of women in the lower classes is in the comparative inelegance and uncleanness of the men in their own class. It also arises from the fondness which all women have for merit, or what they suppose to be such, so that their love is apt to follow what is any way distinguished; and this throws the women of any class cruelly open to the seductions of the men in the class above. For women are the real aristocrats; and it is one of their greatest merits. Men's intellects, even some of the brightest, may occasionally be deceived by theories about equality, and the like, but women, who look at reality more, are rarely led away by nonsense of this kind."

That gentlemen, well washed, well combed, well shaven, wearing clean linen, well ordered clothes, and highly polished boots—to say nothing of their polished manners and brighter intellects—should be more attractive in the eyes of young maidens, whether town-bred or country-bred, than the dirty, slovenly, coarse-looking labouring men by whom they are surrounded, is very easy to understand. But opportunity is more potential even than white hands and fine linen; and it is all on the side of those who belong to the same class as the lowly maiden. That which comes unsought to the rustic lover—which he has not to make a single effort to compass, is only to be obtained by the aristocrat after much labour and calculation. The intercourse of those who are severed by social position must be covertly carried on, and circumspectly contrived. There are so many obstacles to it that few men will take the trouble to surmount them. We believe, indeed, that what is properly designated se-

duction is of no very common occurrence in either rank of life. Far more frequently do accident, opportunity, impulse, the tendencies of constitutional desire, lead to the commission of the unpremeditated sin,—

"The road is dim, the current unperceived,
The weakness painful and most pitiful,
By which a virtuous woman, in pure youth,
May be delivered to distress and shame."*

It may often, indeed, be very hard to determine on which side is the greater amount of crime. It may not be always fair to attribute the blame, in the first instance, solely or mainly to the man. It is in his after conduct that the baseness and selfishness of his character are unfortunately too often evidenced. He is more faithless, more heartless, than the companion of his guilt. Desertion and repudiation generally follow; and the unhappy girl, ruined and betrayed, pays a life-long penalty for a brief season of delusive enjoyment. Men will rarely make reparation; they are callous and obstinate. The cruelty with which they endeavour to escape the results of their imprudence, by blasting more fully the characters of those whose purity they have sullied, is even more deplorable than the first yielding to temptation. And this we fear is the rule, not the exception. Marriage they instinctively shrink from; and the support of their illegitimate offspring is a thing to be evaded by means of reckless denials, and an array of false witnesses such as would disgrace one of the corruptest courts in Hindostan.†

And then is it—the offence committed, and the betrayer refusing to make reparation,—that the crisis of the poor girl's fate is at hand. Often from that which is most beautiful in woman's nature proceeds the evil which we now deplore. She has sinned, but she is not irreclaimable. She is still worth saving. Upon the conduct of others towards her, then, hinges her fate. On this subject, the author of *Companions of my Solitude* has truthfully written:—

"If ever there were an occasion on which men (I say men, but I mean more especially

* Wordsworth's *Excursion*.

† This is, of course, principally in the lower ranks of life; but whether there is more of the heartless desertion, and repudiation of which we have been speaking above, in the higher or the lower ranks of life, is a delicate question, which we can hardly undertake to solve. It must be remembered, however, that the money-penalty which the father of an illegitimate child is compelled to pay, falls far more heavily upon the poor man; but then, on the other hand, the injury to character is greater in the higher ranks of life; so that perhaps the inducements to repudiation are pretty equally balanced.

women) should be careful of scattering abroad unjust and severe sayings, it is in speaking of the frailties and delinquencies of women. For it is one of those things where an unjust judgment or the fear of one breaks down the bridge behind the repentant; and has often made an error into a crime, and a single crime into a life of crime. A daughter has left her home, madly, ever so wickedly, if you like, but what are too often the demons tempting her onwards, and preventing her return? The uncharitable speeches she has heard at home; and the feeling she shares with most of us, that those we have lived with are the sharpest judges of our conduct. Would you, then, exclaims some reader or hearer, take back, and receive with tenderness, a daughter who has erred? 'Yes,' I reply, 'if she had been the most abandoned woman upon earth. . . . A fear of the uncharitable speeches of others is the incentive in many courses of evil; but it has a peculiar effect in the one we are considering, as it comes with most force just at the most critical period—when the victim of seduction is upon the point of falling into worse ways.'

And what the essayist has very simply, but forcibly enumerated, the fiction-writer has thus thrown into action. The good vicar of Little Millbrook is telling the story of Jessie Hart's betrayal on her return home:—

"When I called, Mrs. Hart was still angry, and indignant—clamorous in her upbraidings. She had only the vilest terms of reproach to bestow upon the unhappy girl, and there was no epithet too strong to express her sense of the conduct of the seducer. It was not until I said to her, 'Mrs. Hart, your daughter's seducer is my son,' that she ceased from her upbraidings. Jessie uttered a short, sharp cry, and flung herself on my feet. 'I did not tell her—indeed, I did not,' she said, and clung to me, as though she would deprecate my anger. I raised her, and spoke kindly to her. She was very humble and contrite. Great as was her sorrow, she seemed to think but little of her own sufferings. It touched me to the heart to see how much the poor child thought of the disgrace which this sad affair would bring upon my family. 'And what would I think of her?' she said, 'what would Miss Lucy think?' I said that we should pity her from the very depths of our hearts. I never could see, Sullivan, the benefit of harshness in these cases. The poor are very prone to be harsh to their unfortunate children. They leave them to themselves—send them out into the world to earn their own livelihoods—plunge them into a great sea of temptation, and then pour upon them all the vials of their wrath, if the neglected ones do not chance to swim bravely through it. They only remember that they are parents, when they have something cruel to say. They exercise the painful right of condemning and restraining, though they have forgotten the parental duties of encouraging and supporting. They are angry, because they have to reap as they have sown; and, not seldom, by their ill-timed

severity, perpetuate the evil against which it is addressed. I believe that the chances of reformation are very much in proportion to the amount of kindness and forbearance which is shewn towards the offender in the hour of suffering and remorse. Jessie's heart might have been hardened for ever if I had closed mine against her, as did her ill-judged mother. But I spoke kindly to her; and all the softness of her nature was poured out as in a great flood."

—Gilbert Arnold.

These things are to people who have dwelt long in the country, and have familiarized themselves with the histories of their poorer neighbours, matters of ordinary experience; and there are few who will not confirm the opinion expressed by good Mr. Arnold, to the effect, that the penitence and reformation of the erring daughter are mainly dependent upon the conduct of her parents at this the turning-point, as it were, of her career. From our own experience, we could cite many cases in confirmation of this truth, but one or two examples will suffice:—A girl, the daughter of poor but respectable parents, in a country village in the south of England, was in service, in another county not far from London, but was shortly expected home with the view of obtaining another place in the family of a gentleman, resident scarcely a stone-throw from her father's cottage. She came a week or two before she was expected, and confessed that she had been foully betrayed and cruelly treated by a fellow-servant who had promised her marriage, and then had cast her off with scorn and reproach. Her parents, old people, and in needy circumstances, welcomed her sorrowfully, but not upbraidingly, and the lady, into whose household she was to have been received, did all that womanly kindness and sympathy could do, even to the extent of supporting and aiding her in the hour of trial and danger, to alleviate the poor girl's distress. She was saved. In a little time, another lady in the village, requiring a nurse to suckle her infant, bethought herself of the penitent girl, and made her an offer, which was cheerfully accepted.

"—She no more could bear,
By her offence, to lay a twofold weight
On a kind parent, willing to forget
Their slender means; so to that parent's
care,
Trusting her child, she left their common home,
And with contented spirit undertook
A foster-mother's office."*

So far was the history of this poor girl

* Wordsworth's *Excursion*.

identical with that of her namesake in Wordsworth's touching episode—but the parallel here ceases. The mother of Ellen's foster-child did not forbid all access to her own babe. She did not wish to outrage the maternal instincts within her, and the girl became a better servant, because a more contented one; and, in all probability, a better nurse for the indulgence. At all events, the result was so satisfactory, that when the child no longer needed the nourishment of the breast, the irreproachable conduct of the poor girl had recommended her to a permanent place in the lady's nursery; and so, instead of being driven, as she might have been, to the streets, she recovered her old position, and maintained it, and is, probably, all the more circumspect in her conduct, for the terrible lesson she has learned.

In the same village, another girl of great personal attractions had "stooped to folly," the companion of her guilt being a gentleman of education and position. The circumstances could no longer be concealed. The parents having become acquainted with them, demanded the girl's return. She went home, under an implied promise that no restraint should be put upon her; but no sooner had she recrossed the threshold of her father's cottage, than they began to heap upon her all the vilest terms of reproach, tore the bonnet from her head, trampled it under foot, and swore that she should never again see the partner of her wrong-doing. Then they sent her into one of the sleeping apartments and threatened to confine her under the safe-guard of lock and key. This, however—and they cursed themselves for it—they neglected to do. The poor girl, left alone with her sorrow, stretched herself upon a bed, thought over all the vile reproaches that had been poured upon her, of the angry words of her mother and the violent conduct of her father—above all, of the stern threat that she should never again be suffered to see the man whom she loved—and thinking over all these things, she took her resolution, and determined on precipitate flight. It was night. The opportunity was not to be resisted. Putting on the few articles of apparel of which she had divested herself, she quietly stole down stairs and escaped. From that time the influence of the parents over the child was gone for ever. It was not to be recovered; and the girl was not consigned to utter and irretrievable ruin, by their injudicious and unkindly conduct, only because the man, in whom she had confided, was not thoroughly heartless and depraved. If he had cast her off in

that conjuncture, there would have been nothing left her but the streets.*

Now these are common circumstances—and recited here under a conviction that they are common. If they were not so, it would be of little use to introduce them into such an article as this. But after all, the great matter for consideration is not so much what is best to be done after daughters have erred, as what is best to keep them from erring. Prevention is always better than cure, and never more so than in such cases as this. Now, it appears to us that there are two great things to be done—or rightly considered, indeed, the two are drawn by close connexion into one. If our village girls, at the dangerous period of incipient womanhood, were sufficiently occupied, and if they were brought more frequently into contact with their richer neighbours, there would be far less chance of their going astray. They go astray, in no small measure, because they have nothing to do, and because nobody cares for them. The expression and exemplification of a little kindly interest and sympathy would go a great way with them, and in no manner could this kindly interest be more effectually exemplified than by giving them the means of profitably occupying their time. What we mean is very well expressed in the story of *Gilbert Arnold*:—

"It was part of their system to encourage the young village girls to come often to the parsonage. Miss Arnold lent them books to read, gave them needlework to do—often had a little sewing class in her own room; one of the girls reading aloud to the others as they plied their needles under the young lady's eye. . . . Mr. Arnold believed that, far more serviceable than all pulpit preaching, would be such kindly intercourse with the poor as would sow deep in their hearts the conviction, that they were cared

* It may, we anticipate, be said, that the two cases being dissimilar in their antecedents, might not call for the same amount of indulgence from the parents—inasmuch as that one unfortunate, was prepared to "sin no more," and the other, perhaps, was not. But it appears to us, that in the latter case, the same amount of indulgence was demanded—but infinitely more judgment in its management. Many people argue, that kindness and forbearance are only to be earned by the cessation of the offence; that our charity is to be reserved for those who have some merit whereby to claim it. But there is no merit in mere circumstance. A girl betrayed, abandoned, perhaps cruelly treated, even to blows, is naturally sorry for what she has done, or rather for what has been done to her. She has not, in reality, broken off the unholy connexion she has formed; it has been broken off in spite of her. There is no merit in this. It is easy to deal with such a case; but when the first wrong has not been consummated by desertion and cruelty, more than common kindness and judgment are demanded to win back the erring one to repentance.

for by people higher and holier than themselves. He strove to encourage an outward sense of their own dignity and importance, and to induce them to consider that there were earthly friends to whom they were bound by ties of almost parental gratitude to render an account of themselves. At all events, he let them know, that he was watching over them—that their sorrow would be his sorrow, and their shame his shame. In this good work, his gentle daughter was a willing and influential associate. Miss Arnold knew how much might be done by womanly kindness and womanly example, to raise the condition and the character of her neglected sisterhood, and, frail as was her body, she threw her heart and soul, with strength and eagerness, into the good cause. It was a work however, which was not to be done at once. The great jungle of that neglected parish was not to be suddenly reduced into a well-trimmed garden. But the improvement was something visible and substantial. It took shape under their hands. They knew that they were not working in vain. . . . Miss Arnold delighted, as I have said, to bring the young girls to the parsonage, and to associate constantly with them. Knowing how true it is, that Satan ever finds 'some mischief still, for idle hands to do,' she exerted herself to keep the hands of the Millbrook girls constantly employed. She found them in respect of needlework, mere bunglers. They spoil almost everything that was put into their hands. Such puckering and botching, Lucy Arnold had never seen before. All this was soon amended and reformed. A very little teaching—such pleasant teaching as was current at the parsonage—soon raised the standard of needlework throughout the parish. And, in a little while, the Millbrook girls were eagerly sought after as serving maidens, because they were known to be the best sempstresses in the country."

Now, the effect of this kind of kindly intercourse between the rich and the poor is greatly enhanced—as we shall presently take occasion to observe more in detail—when over and above the ordinary prestige of social rank is that of the ministerial office. But an immense deal of good may be done by the laity in this direction. It is difficult, indeed, to over-estimate the social importance of the intercommunication of classes; and especially as it affects the characters and circumstances of the young women of our rural districts. Any lady residing in a country village—no matter how limited her pecuniary means—may do very much, by the exercise of a little womanly kindness, to gather around her the daughters of her poorer neighbors, to win their confidence and esteem, to supply them with agreeable occupation, and thus by eliminating new sources of interest and new modes of employment, help them to lead lives at once more pleasant and more profitable. The great parent evil to be combated is *idleness*. But what are these great grown girls to do,

just at the most perilous of ages, if no one will give them a helping hand? They must have something to interest them. Sources of innocent pleasure are sealed against them. If they have nothing better to think and to talk about, it is not strange that they should think and talk about their neighbours; if they have nothing better to do, it is not strange that when opportunity offers, they should fall into evil. The best thing, therefore, that can be done in such cases, is to supply occupation both for mind and body; and if this cannot be accomplished, we may always show that we are interested in the welfare of our lowly neighbours, and are watching their careers. And this in itself is no small matter. Many a girl has been saved, in the hour of temptation, by asking herself what will be thought of her conduct by some friend and benefactor, who has taken a kindly interest in her career.

As regards employment for the daughters of the poor, whilst under the parental roof, all that can be done for them may be pretty well expressed by the one word *needlework*. The greater number of them are intended for domestic service if situations can be found; but situations cannot always be found, and in the meanwhile they are to be kept out of mischief and prepared for the business to which their lives are to be devoted. It would be right if there were a little more preparation. Good servants, perhaps, would not then be so rare. The requisite training, however, in all its various branches, is not easily obtainable out of an institution. But needlework is always to be learnt. A great deal has been written about the multitudes of expert needle-women, who can hardly keep, by incessant labour, body and soul together; and there is a general impression, that throughout the country the supply of good needlework is greatly in excess of the demand. But this is true only so far as it applies to the great towns. In the country good needlework is rare and commands a fair price. The experience of most residents in the country will enable them to confirm our assertion, that it is not *easily* obtainable at any price. There is, as Mr. Carlyle says, of "distracted puckering and botching" a *quantum suff*, but of good needlework little or none, and this he says is the "saddest thing of all." And so it is; but if our English ladies would only take the trouble to do what Miss Arnold is said to have done in the little story before us, there would be less distracted puckering and botching of morals as well as of longcloth. And there is this fact to be impressed, by way of encouragement, upon all country girls, who turn away from the practice of

needlework as a dreary occupation, that precisely in proportion to the adroitness with which they manage the needle are their chances of obtaining good situations in respectable families. One of the first questions asked is, "Are you a good needle-woman?"

Now, almost every lady in the country, at the head of a moderate-sized establishment, has the means of keeping, to her own advantage, many hands employed at the needle. It may, to be sure, be a question with her whether she might not purchase all required articles of apparel for her household ready-made, at a lower price in the metropolis; but low-priced things are not always cheap ones, and perhaps, looking at the matter in the narrowest point of view, it is not so certain that one can obtain one's money's worth for one's money, so well by betaking one's-self to the great labour-mart. We are not, however, now discussing the commercial bearings of the question. We desire rather to impress upon our English gentlewomen the duty of employing in this manner, to the utmost extent of their ability, the poor people by whom they are surrounded, of instructing and improving them in their work, and rendering it as agreeable as possible, by combining with it pleasant and instructive conversation, or better still, reading aloud. If once or twice a week, a lady would muster, in her own house, a little class of needle-women, under her own personal superintendence, making each girl in turn read aloud for a certain time to the working party, she would not only improve them in reading and needlework, but would in all probability obtain a salutary influence over them which would not easily pass away. Indeed, if nothing else resulted from this, the kindly intercourse thus established would in itself be a great matter. It is no small thing for our gentry even to know the poor.

In connexion with this there naturally occurs the consideration of the general question of female employment, but it is too large a one to be treated incidentally in this place. We purpose only to make one remark in connexion with it. In many country villages there is to be found a large shop, in which grocery and haberdashery are sold—in fact, almost everything that householders can require—from a carpet to an ounce of salts. The proprietors of these establishments often drive a large and profitable trade, and employ a considerable number of hands. These "hands" are pretty sure to be male ones. This is a state of things not peculiar to our villages, though some of the evils resulting from it are. It is com-

mon, indeed, to all places. But if there be anything in the world that is distasteful to us in any description of honest labour, it is the sight of a man measuring out yards of ribband and tape, and displaying dress-pieces to the view. We will not say that the occupation is a degrading one. No description of honest labour is degrading. But these men not only appear to us miserably out of place, but to have thrust others out of their proper sphere—altogether to have usurped a calling which rightfully belongs to the other sex. Perhaps there is a meaning in this. The principal frequenters of these large village shops are women. The shop is the great gossip hall of the neighbourhood. Many visit it as a place of public resort more frequently than their necessities compel them to do. The proprietors are, perhaps, aware of this, and encourage the conviction that if the retail-work of the shop were confided to young women, instead of young men, there would be a falling off in the business. Perhaps there would—though it is just possible that the falling off in the custom of maid-servants and small tradesmen's daughters, might be compensated for by the more frequent visits of the ladies of the neighbourhood, to whom the race of shop-boys is generally obnoxious.

Altogether these large shops appear to us in the light of an evil—both as respects the moral purity and the commercial prosperity of the villages in which they are located. The young men who serve in them are, for the most part, objects of admiration to the village girls. They are better dressed, more cleanly in their persons, and less coarse (though really more vulgar, for there is more assumption) in their manners, than the peasantry by whom they are surrounded. They are fortunately too much occupied during the week to do any great amount of mischief, but they unquestionably do some—and the more so that, inasmuch as they seldom look to any very protracted sojourn in one place, they are not very tenacious on the score of character. But, perhaps, greater harm is done by the absorption of the trade of the village. A capitalist often establishes three or four—perhaps as many as half a dozen large shops, in different parts of the country. He looks to small profits and a large trade. Having a command of money, he purchases cheaply and therefore can sell cheaply. This is, doubtless, *primâ facie*, an advantage to the consumer; but it is not so certain that the labouring classes would not derive more permanent and substantial advantage from a more general diffusion of prosperity throughout the village. It would give employment to a larger number of

people. It would act and react in a variety of different ways. It would keep respectable old village families from gradual decline, (it is common now to see them undersold and driven out by aliens,) and would, certainly, give our village girls a better chance of marrying in a respectable way. Indeed, that which drains the money out of a village can never be advantageous to it. In all probability, the very shop-boys in these large establishments are strangers; so that they do not even afford employment to a handful of the village population.

But here again, as in all other cases, it is to be remarked that everything depends upon the conduct of the rich. Our village trades-people are in a depressed condition, because the gentry of the neighbourhood will not give them encouragement. The gentry complain, perhaps not without some reason, as regards the fact itself, that they can obtain neither good nor cheap articles of consumption in their own village. They forget that they are themselves the cause of this,—that if they would patronize these small trades-people more liberally they would find them more worthy of their patronage. They starve the trade of the village, and then complain that it is in a weak, exhausted condition. The duty of spending their money among their neighbours they are not inclined to recognise. They obtain everything that they can obtain from London, or the nearest large town, and say that they are compelled to do it because they cannot obtain anything nearer at hand. It is their own fault if they cannot. Let the demand be created, and the supply will not be long in the rear.

It is the commonest of all remarks in the country, that the wealthy families spend very little money among their immediate neighbours. It would seem, at first, that if a gentleman of small income—say, from £600 to £800 a year—establishes himself in or near a country village, and does a considerable amount of good simply by spending the greater part of his income in his own parish, another, with an income of £6000 or £8000 a year, will do ten times as much good. But, unfortunately, these men who count their revenue by thousands are precisely those who will not spend it among their neighbours. "It must be a great advantage to you," we have sometimes said to a small village tradesman, "when Sir Robert — and Mr. — come into the neighbourhood, with their large families, and overgrown establishments, to remain for five or six months of the year among you;" or, when "— Hall" or "— Place," after remaining untenanted for some time, has been taken by

a family of rank, we have, perhaps, made a similar remark on the advantages to be expected from the contiguity of another great member of the consuming classes. But we have been accustomed to receive the same answer: a shrug, a sigh, and a declaration that these people "get everything from London,"—or York,—or Exeter,—as the case may be. On the arrival of a new family in the neighbourhood, the first start is often an ominous one. The old place wants repair: a new wing is to be erected, or a new conservatory is to be built. There are bricklayers and carpenters and glaziers in the neighbourhood; but all the workmen required for the improvement of the Hall are brought down from London for the purpose. The family arrives with a ready-made establishment of servants, many of them, perhaps, hired expressly for the country, as though there were not scores of healthy and active girls in the parish eager for domestic service. Then it is soon known that they have brought down with them a whole van-load of "stores;" in fact, that they intend to have as little as possible to do with the poor people who live around them. Perhaps the fault is not so much theirs, as that of some of the older residents in the neighbourhood, who have told them beforehand that they can "get nothing in the place." Indeed, even that kind of acquaintance with the condition of the people, which long residence in a neighbourhood ordinarily engenders, has seldom the effect of opening the hearts and the hands of the rich, and teaching them to recognise the duty of acting in a neighbourly manner towards the poor, by spending their money amongst them. The clergy, it may be said, do not always set the example. The parson and the squire sometimes put their heads together to "restore" the parish church, and will not even suffer the people of the parish to carry a brick, or saw a plank for the purpose.

All this is very bad: nothing worse. If there be one duty more imperative upon the rich than another, it is the duty of giving the utmost possible amount of employment to their poorer neighbours. In every rural district we shall find hundreds eager to be employed. All kinds of artisans are complaining that work is slack, and the statement is generally accompanied with the complaint that their wealthy neighbours will not employ them when the opportunity offers, but bring in strangers and interlopers to do their work. An extensive job, which might confer incalculable benefit on several poor and deserving families, is given to a large contractor, who probably undertakes

it as a favour, and not one of the regular hands in constant work under him, employed upon the job, feels any elation of heart at being sent down to perform it.

On the subject of the employment of the agricultural poor, it may be observed, that in those neighbourhoods where the subject is most conscientiously regarded, the burdens on land are always the lightest. Even if we employ the poor on what is primarily unprofitable work—that is to say, work which does not ostensibly yield money's-worth for the money expended upon it—we are pretty sure to find in the end that we have made an advantageous investment. It will come back to us in the shape of diminished poor-rates and county rates. Poor-houses and prisons are very expensive luxuries. We shall find it answer the purpose better to combine together to provide employment for the poor during those seasons of the year when the land does not necessarily call for cultivation. It is far better to give a man work than to give him money. A great deal of good, too, may be done by giving idle boys little jobs of work, in weeding gardens, &c. Such innocent and profitable occupation will keep many a boy from forming those habits which help him eventually to end his life in a penal settlement.

We have said nothing about the schoolmaster in this Article. We are not writing of the duties of the State, but of the duties of individuals; and the subject of education is a too large a one to be slurred over with an incidental notice. We cannot pause to inquire in what manner the great machinery ought to be set a-going. It is too mighty to be managed by private hands, but private hands may still do much. Every person, indeed, who, at his own cost, educates another, having no direct claim upon him, whether at a public or private school, has done a great thing. At all events, he is not living to no purpose. Now, it is generally to be observed, in our country villages, that education is very ineffective, because both boys and girls are taken too soon away from school. Parents when told of this, acknowledge the fact, but declare that they cannot help it: "We wish," they say, "to deal fairly by them all; to let all share alike; and we are obliged to take away the elder ones, that the younger may get a little schooling. We cannot afford to keep so many at school at the same time." The best answer that can be given to this is an offer to do it for them. It is precisely at the age when boys and girls in our country villages are most frequently taken away from school that it is most important to keep them there; for it is just at this age that educa-

tion begins to take something like root, and that the evil of want of occupation is most sensibly felt. If at this dangerous period of life a kind friend steps in and enables the parent to give his child another year or two's schooling, he not only prevents, perhaps, all the preceding instruction from being thrown away, but he keeps the young scholar out of the way of an amount of moral harm which it is not easy to over-estimate.

But after all, the work of education is not confined to the schoolmaster and the schoolmistress. There are other agencies no less important to the effectiveness of which every individual in the upper classes may largely contribute. We are not about to indulge in any fine writing about the education of the heart; but we wish to say a few words about what the author of *Companions of my Solitude* calls "continuous cultivation."

"When continuous cultivation," he writes, "is joined to education, (which should be the object for statesmen and governing people of all kinds,) people will not be supposed to be educated at the time of their nonage, and then lost sight of and held off for evermore, as far as regards their betters. But it will be seen that we are all so far children in some respects, throughout our lives, that the means of cultivation should be successively offered to us. . . . What I mean is this: do not let us merely teach our poor young people to read and write, and hear about all manner of arts, sciences, and productions, and then dropping these people at the most dangerous age, provide no amusements, enable them to carry on no pursuits, throw open no refinements of life to them, shew them no parks, no gardens, and leave them to the pot-house and their sordid homes. Of course they will go wrong, if we do."

Now, we cannot, all of us, throw open parks and gardens to the poor, but we can do something to provide them with innocent amusement, and enable them to carry on improving pursuits. Everybody who lends a good book to a person unable to obtain the use of books, from other sources, does a great thing. To establish a lending library in a village, no matter how small, is proportionately a greater thing. We believe that this is easily to be done. A single individual has sometimes done it from his own superfluous literary stores, enhanced by a few special purchases suited to the particular wants of his poorer neighbours. Of course, if people in the upper classes will combine together to do these things, they are done with greater facility, and on a larger and more effective scale. But no one should be disheartened by want of co-operation. Different people think so differently about these matters. There is so much jealousy, and so little cordiality

and unselfishness even among people who wish to do good, that anything like genuine fellowship in these concerns is hardly to be expected. The best thing that every one can do, in these cases, is to depend as little as possible on others, and as much as possible on himself. Whilst he is looking about for others to help him, and complaining of their jealousy or their indifference, the weeds are growing under his feet, and every day of inaction on his part renders it more difficult to root them out.

But whilst we would exhort every man to do the best that he can, without reference either to the much, or to the little, that is done by others, we must again acknowledge, that there is much virtue in co-operation, and in no matter more certainly, than in that of which we are now immediately writing. An isolated lending library in a country village, is a very good thing; but it requires the support of other lending libraries in the neighbourhood to render it permanently efficacious. On its first establishment, there is pretty sure to be a heavy run upon it. The novelty of having books at command, is something exhilarating and exciting; and the villagers, especially the boys and the girls, and the old people who are past work, are continually coming to exchange them. But after a while, the demand begins to languish. The readers have "had the pick" of the library, and they either have, or think they have, had all the books that they care to read. If, then, the proprietor of the library can, at this point, exchange it for another, established in a neighbouring village, he can revive the declining appetite by offering his neighbours a feast of new intellectual viands. There will be, again, a run upon the book-shelves; and, again, pleasant and improving occupation will be in the reach of all who have their own time at their disposal, and who are often driven into evil courses, solely by the want of "something better to do."

A different description of institution, but one not less serviceable in a country village, is the savings club. This matter of the savings of the poor, is one with which legislatures have concerned themselves, but to which, nevertheless, individuals may well direct their attention. If any benevolent lady, on some stated day of every week, will receive the savings of the poor—no matter how small the weekly contribution—and return it to them at the end of the year, say on Christmas day, with, or even without interest, she will draw largely upon the gratitude of her humble neighbours. The club will not have been long in operation, before,

on taking her place at the desk, with her account-book before her, there will be a crowd of women and children at her door; and a perfect shower of pence ready to descend upon her table. It would be superfluous to discourse upon the good that is done by engendering habits of providence among the poor, or upon the delight with which the hoarded pence are welcomed back again, by old and young, at the end of the year, perhaps with some seasonable addition, from the purse of the disinterested banker. But we may remark, that not the least of the advantages resulting from such an institution, is the means of intercommunication that it affords—the opportunity which it yields of improving our acquaintance with the habits and histories of our lowly neighbours.

But it is time now, that, having indicated some of the many means at the disposal of the laity, for the improvement of the condition of the poor in our country villages, we should say something about the especial duties of the clergy. There are many points, on which the two writers, whose works we have named at the head of this article, concur strikingly in opinion; and in nothing is this more apparent than in their estimate of the lukewarmness of the Anglican Ministry. What the one has thrown out incidentally in the pages of his brief fiction, the other has laid down in a more authoritative and didactic manner, but still with no want of a genuine feeling. Here is a little outline, sketched by the former, of one type of the English clergyman, and not, we fear, a very uncommon one in the South:—

"Before the advent of the Arnolds the parish had been much neglected. The previous incumbent was a rich man, who might have done great things for the poor. But having the power he had not the will. He drove through the village sometimes in his high, double-bodied, well-horsed phaeton, from which his liveried servant pompously descended to deliver a message at the clerk's door; but the poor people said of him that he never entered their cottages, even to ask if there was a bible on their shelves."—*Gilbert Arnold.*

Such a man marches, with a stately formality along the high road of clerical life, as though he had become a "successor of the apostles," only to preach a dull sermon once a week, out of a wooden box; and, perhaps, to study church architecture. It is, indeed, as the author of *Friends in Council* says, "past melancholy, and verging on despair."

"Meanwhile, it is past melancholy and verges

on despair, to reflect what is going on amongst ministers of religion, who are often but too intent upon the fopperies of religion to have heart and time for the substantial work entrusted to them—immersed in heart-breaking trash from which no sect is free; for here are fopperies of discipline, there are fopperies of doctrine, (still more dangerous as it seems to me.) And yet there are these words resounding in their ears, 'Pure religion and undefiled is this, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, and to keep one's-self unspotted from the world.' And the word 'world,' as Coleridge has well explained, is this order of things, the order of things you are in. Clerical niceness and oversanctity for example, and making more and longer sermons than there is any occasion for, and insisting upon needless points of doctrine, and making Christianity a stumbling-block to many, that excellent clergymen, for there are numbers who deserve the name, that is your world, there lies your temptation to err."—*Companions of my Solitude*, p. 113.

These long and weary sermons are, we say, conceived by many English clergymen to constitute their weekly work; and yet, even in the pulpit, the Anglican Ministry are for the most part very cold and formal—much given to descant upon certain set themes, in a hard didactic manner, and never reaching the hearts of their congregations. We are told of Mr. Earle's model minister, that "it had always been his wont, more or less, to adapt his public preaching to parochial circumstances; and in this lay the secret of the interest he awakened—the success he accomplished among his hearers. And more than one illustration of this practice, and its results, is given in the course of the story. It would be well if the practice were more general in actual life. It is, simply, to make the dry bones live—to clothe with leafy verdure the barren tree. Men sit out a sermon, carry off not a word of it, and then go home to read with interest long articles in their Sunday paper. They read the articles, because there is a certain *apropos-ism* about them, because they relate to subjects of passing interest, and could not by any possibility have been brought out, covered with dust, from an old drawer. It is the absence of all special application, which generally renders our pulpit discourses so dull and lifeless. It would often seem, as though the preacher had no other object than to acquit himself of certain obligations imposed upon him, as the condition of his being allowed to receive annually, certain hundreds of the parochial money. A fixed *minimum* of work is to be got through. It does not much matter how. The Sunday duties are supposed to be the duties of the week—the pulpit to be the limit of the

sphere of ministerial action. Far other are the views of ministerial obligations, taken by the writers before us. Mr. Earle's model clergyman is one of a very different stamp:—

"Mr. Arnold was one of those who believe, that only a small part of their ministerial work is to be done within the walls of the church; and he spent much of his time in the cottages of his poorer neighbours. It was a sore trial to him, therefore, when he found that he was little able to go abroad; for though he threw open the doors of the rectory, and invited all to enter them, who needed his assistance and advice, he felt that their occasional visits to his study were but a poor substitute for his visits to the cottage parlours of his lowly brethren. It is hard to say how much the aspect of those little parlours had improved since Mr. Arnold and his gentle daughter, with an abundant store always of kind looks and cheering words, and often with more substantial but scarcely more welcome blessings, had been wont to cast the sunshine of their presence across the threshold of those cottage-homes. None knew better than Mr. Arnold, the intimate connexion between household comfort and Christian morality—and none ever did more to encourage the growth of the former, by demonstrating his paternal interest in the welfare of the poor, and teaching them to have respect for themselves. Many a clean and orderly home, with its little plot of well-cultivated garden ground, and its little shelf of books in-doors, owed its existence, where once had been waste and disorder, to the neighbourly visits of the rector of Little Millbrook."

We have already spoken of the good effect of the visits of the laity to the cottages of the village poor. It is obvious that the visits of the minister must be operative for far greater good:—

"There should," says the author of *Friends in Council*, "be some better means of communication between rich and poor than there is at present. It seems as if the priests of all religions might perform that function, and that it should be considered one of the most important functions. It should be done, if possible, by some persons who come amongst the poor for other purposes than to relieve their poverty."—*Companions of my Solitude*, p. 109.

Unquestionably it should; and equally true is the converse of this proposition. The great moral and religious truths which we are anxious to inculcate for the guidance and improvement of the poor ought to be impressed upon them by those who do not go among them only to teach. It is the union of the two offices—of the earthly and the spiritual comforter—which works so mightily upon the natures of the ignorant and the suffering. Any person of education and of superior worldly station goes among

the poor and the unenlightened as one having authority, and is listened to with respect. There is an instinctive looking upwards, which renders the work of instruction, if accompanied with consolation, comparatively an easy task. But it *must* be accompanied with consolation. The one must ever aid the other. Now, in the case of laymen, the work of instruction must be subordinate to that of consolation. We mean that the primal object of the visit to the poor cottage must be to inquire into, and as far as possible to relieve the physical wants of its inmates. It may be, indeed, a mere visit of inquiry, a casual dropping in, with no apparent or at least obtrusive object; and probably such visits are of all the most appreciated. Advice may often, in such cases, be insinuated with good effect; but there are a thousand things which a minister may ask and say, which would be regarded and perhaps resented as impertinences, if uttered by those who have not the ministerial privilege and authority. It is the clergyman's office to teach; and he goes among his poorer brethren, not merely with the authority of a person of superior rank and education, but with an official stamp upon him, which gives currency to everything that he utters. He may ask any question; he may tender any advice. The effect of his inquiries and his explanations may be increased or diminished by the amount of tact and good feeling apparent in his communications with his humbler neighbours; but he will always have an advantage over the layman. He will always be able to accomplish more than even the wealthiest of his parishioners. He may have the means of giving less at his disposal; he may have less wisdom, less experience, less kindliness, than his secular neighbour. But the ministerial office makes good every deficiency; it supplies what is wanting, and strengthens what is weak, and gives to the most insignificant of men an extrinsic importance, in the eyes of the poor, of which nothing can wholly divest him.

So strong, indeed, among the poor is the instinctive feeling that, in seasons of difficulty and perplexity, the minister is to be looked to for advice and assistance, that even those who seldom or never enter the Church and openly profess no personal respect for the incumbent, will at such times talk of betaking themselves to him in their trouble, and perhaps carry the resolution into effect. And this will happen even in parishes where little encouragement is given to such confidences, and the minister is rarely, if at all, to be seen in the houses of the poor. Unless there be some open and notorious scan-

dal in his way of life—and such a state of things cannot exist for any length of time without bringing its remedy—the clergyman of the Parish is generally regarded as a man wiser and holier than his neighbours. However lightly he may regard the obligations and responsibilities of the ministerial office, he cannot wholly destroy its *prestige*. It will cling to him in spite of himself.

It is an easy matter, therefore, for a clergyman to establish such an empire in the hearts of his parishioners, as will enable him almost to do with them whatsoever he will. Of course, such power is liable to abuse. We know that it has often been terribly abused by the priesthood of a religion that wages war against our own; but even from the practice of that priesthood some lessons may be learnt—*fas est ab hoste doceri*—and the essential difference of Romanism and Protestantism is such, that the ascendancy of which we speak, though in the one instance it may take the shape of an intolerable tyranny, in the other is nothing more than a mild pastoral influence—the sovereignty not of fear but of love.

At all events, it is very dreadful to see the blank indifference of a considerable section of our Protestant clergy, and the heart-breaking results of the apathy we deplore. An English village with an apathetic minister is pretty sure to be a hot-bed of immorality. It is not to be wondered at. When the shepherd is asleep, the sheep will stray. The efforts of the laity, in such a case, may accomplish something; but when the minister discourages, or perhaps opposes them, it is up-hill work for private benevolence. It is a terrible thing to write, but we have known instances of English clergymen who have resented the charitable endeavours of their parishioners as impertinent intrusions—flagrant trespasses, as it were, on the ministerial domain in which they themselves never plant a foot. The village-priest, who himself is active in well-doing, delights in the co-operation of the laity. But it is not difficult to understand why the man who neglects his own duty should be chagrined by the foreign activity which renders his own neglect more revoltingly apparent.

In the end, then, it comes to this: There is so much to be done—and so easy and so pleasant is the doing of it—in our country villages, that when we learn that this or that "Little Millbrook"—some charming little country nook, remote from towns, on which nature seems to smile at all seasons of the year—is lapped in anything but a state of Arcadian purity and simplicity, it were well that we should not declaim against the wick-

edness of the poor and the ignorant, but should lift up our voices against the indolence and the apathy of the rich. It were well that we should never forget that the disgrace of the prevalent immorality really attaches to the influential of all classes, but primarily and especially to that class which possesses a distinct and indestructible influence of its own. Where the "simple annals of the poor" are a sealed book to the rich, there is sure to be misery and vice, even in the fairest spots which God has created for the habitation of Christian men.

But there is this difference between the suffering and the sin which grow in our towns and in our villages, that the application of the remedy to the latter is comparatively easy, and that individual efforts may do much in the one case, whilst in the other the machinery of extensive societies is rendered, by the magnitude of the disease, a necessary evil. We have merely attempted to indicate how, in a few not unimportant particulars, these individual efforts may be brought to bear beneficially upon the condition of our village communities. To many whom we have addressed much that we have written is, we hope, practically familiar. They will not quarrel with us, we are sure, for discoursing upon matters which, however well understood by them, and admitted perhaps by many others, still loudly call for a far more extensive practical recognition than has yet been accorded to them. It has been our endeavour to write simply of common and easy things; and we have done so under the profoundest possible conviction that no one will ever accuse us of misleading him by asserting that the things of which we have written are as pleasant as they are easy in performance. We look after happiness in the wrong direction when we turn our backs upon our lowly brethren.

We do not wish it to be inferred from these remarks, that the tendency of the present age is towards any greater neglect of those duties which especially appertain to the rich, than is fairly chargeable against antecedent generations. We believe that if the very reverse of this were asserted, there would be no departure from the literal truth. But it is necessary that we should think much more about these things, and exert ourselves much more than we did of old, for some of the practical results of the advancement of science are clearly prejudicial to the interests of our village communities. Steam-begotten centralization is doing fearful damage to our rural districts. The days when rich families were compelled not only to reside, but to spend their money in the

country, have now passed away. The railway train carries men up to town, and carries things down into the country. Many who breathe the fresh country air, scornfully reject almost everything else that the country supplies. It would be sad, indeed, if there were not something to balance this; and the something must be looked for in a growing conviction of the claims of the poor, and an increased apprehension of the duties of the rich. But this is the age of societies—of charitable institutions of every conceivable kind—and too many of us are mere *givers*. What we would fain see is a larger number of *doers*. Subscribers to the great public charities may do good. We do not deny it. But what is mainly wanted in these days is, a something less of exclusiveness—something to break down the mighty barriers which now separate the rich and the poor. We might spare some portion of our alms if we could induce ourselves to become less chary of our personal presence among the poor, and less niggardly of kind words to them. "The poor we have always with us." Let us endeavour as far as in us lies, to be always with the poor.*

ART. IV.—*Protestantism and Catholicity Compared in their Effects on the Civilisation of Europe.* By the Rev. J. BALMEZ. Translated from the Spanish by C. J. HANDFORD and R. KERSHAW. London, J. Burns.

LAST autumn, at the Exhibition of the Industry of all Nations, a mercantile friend of ours encountered the Mayor of Bilbao, a Spanish town on the Bay of Biscay. After expressing the pleasure of so unexpected a meeting with his old Spanish correspondent, the Scotchman inquiringly remarked that the Mayor could meet few of his countrymen at the Exhibition. Few! exclaimed the Spanish mayor,—yesterday, at our hotel, I sat down to dinner with seventy Spaniards. Well done Spain, we involuntarily exclaimed, on hearing this incident. Seventy Spaniards at one time visiting heretic England, and drawn hither by industrial tastes and their mercantile spirit!—is not this a hopeful

* A little volume, with the significant title of "*The Poor ye have always with you*," recently published by Mr. Bentley, has been laid before us whilst these sheets were under correction for the press. It is a translation from the French; but this does not preclude us from saying that it is full of good sense and good feeling, and cannot be read without profit to the reader.

symptom of the reviving energies and freedom of Spanish merchants?

France began her career of revolutions by the massacre and banishment of her priests and nobles. Spain has done better by lessening their numbers, revenues, and privileges, and preserving a clergy and nobility to countervail infidelity, socialism, and revolution, who may one day become honest and intelligent instructors and trusted leaders of the Spanish nation. Meanwhile, it is something that the Mayor of Bilbao and his friends can visit heretic England on business, at pleasure, without let or hindrance from priest or Pope.

At the head of this Article is the work of a Spanish ecclesiastic, the Abbé Balmez, who, at the period of his recent death, at the early age of thirty-eight, is said to have been the leader of a new intellectual school in Spain, and who seems to have exerted no small influence while he lived, in the internal revival and restoration of the Spanish Church, amidst recent civil revolutions. Balmez writes like a man who knows the times in which he writes; though rejecting none of the old ways of defence, when available, he now boldly challenges for his church a superiority over all churches and all human things, specially, on the sober, solid, matter of fact, and ascertainable ground of her superiority in developing European civilisation.

This work first appeared, say the translators, in a small town of Catalonia, in 1840, created a sensation in Madrid, is said to have been read by all the readers of Spain, was translated into French, to persuade the *Grande Nation* to seek progress only under the banners of Rome; and it is now presented, in an English dress, by two zealous members of the Anglo-Roman Church, to remove our Protestant prejudices against entrusting Rome with the guardianship and further development of our British liberties and civilisation.

The translators tell us further, that it was prepared to avert the crisis to church property, then approaching, which has since so much reduced the revenues and revived the energies of the Spanish Church.* It is more interesting, however, to learn from Balmez himself what those feelings and fears were which, as a Spanish churchman, inspired his pen:—

* According to the article Spain in the Encyclopædia Britannica, the revenue of the Spanish Church, before the late confiscation, was above twelve millions sterling—two millions more than the entire national revenue. What it is now we are unable to say; we believe, from the accounts of Inglis, and a recent American traveller, very considerable, and likely to become much greater, as Spain again develops her agricultural and mineral wealth.

"It is not impossible that, during one of the convulsions which disturb our unhappy country, men may arise amongst us, blind enough to attempt to introduce the Protestant religion into Spain. We have had warnings enough to alarm us; we have not forgotten events which shewed plainly enough how far some would sometimes have gone, if the great majority of the nation had not restrained them by their disapprobation. We do not dread the outrages of the reign of Henry the Eighth; but what we do fear is, that advantage may be taken of a violent rupture with the Holy See, of the obstinacy and ambition of some ecclesiastics, of the pretext of establishing toleration in our country, or of some other pretext, to attempt to introduce amongst us, in some shape or other, the doctrines of Protestantism."

Again—

"We must not forget that, with respect to religion in Spain, we cannot calculate on the coldness and indifference which other nations would display on a similar occasion. With the latter, religious feelings have lost much of their force, but in Spain, they are still deep, lively, and energetic, and if they were to come into open and avowed opposition to each other, the shock would be violent and general."

Then changing his tone—

"Will you consent to see dried up, the most abundant fountains to which we can have recourse to revive literature, to strengthen science, to regenerate legislation, to re-establish the spirit of nationality, to restore our glory, and replace this nation on the high position which her virtues merit, by restoring to her the peace and happiness which she seeks with so much toil, and which her heart requires?"—Pp. 41, 48.

These extracts reveal, that up to 1840, among the lovers of Spanish progress, the dangerous opinion had been gaining ground, that Protestantism, with its divisions, might be more favourable to Spanish progress than Romanism, with its darling unity. For a Spanish ecclesiastic, the Abbé Balmez had rare opportunities of knowing this. For some years he is said to have edited the ablest journal in Spain, "*El Pensamiento de la Nacion*," and also a Spanish Review, published at Barcelona. Such engagements brought him into contact with the living, modern, and commercial world of Spain, and enabled him to know the breath of her public opinion. He had learned that his countrymen were looking practically at churches as at governments, weighing results, and applying that test, alike of common sense and divine wisdom, "by their fruits ye shall know them," and as to the kind of fruits, Spaniards were no longer to be satisfied with the honour of being the most Catholic of nations, but like the rest of Europe, looked to realize as part of the fruits of a good church

system, "the life that now is." Father Balmez must have often heard in certain quarters of Spanish society, the saying of the French Statesman:—"In England the Jesuits ruined kings, in Spain the people," and the still more pungent one of her own Bishop, "that the Jesuits found Spain a nation of heroes, and left her a nation of hens." Feeling the breath of this public opinion, and stung by such inquiries and reproaches, this Spanish churchman took up his pen, and has produced this elaborate and well-written book—a book whose appearance, whose style and arguments, like the appearance of the Mayor of Bilboa and his seventy Spaniards at last year's Exhibition, are significant in Spain—

—————"Of the reign commenced
Of rescued nature and reviving sense,"

of the breaking forth of somewhat of that national good sense that, in the 16th century, laughed with Cervantes at the absurdities of its own darling chivalry, and is now counting its past losses and sacrifices to priests and Popes—comparing Spain with her former self, and with those European nations that have not sacrificed the Gospel to the church, nor arrested national progress to preserve ecclesiastical unity.

But the work of Balmez is more significant still of the anxiety of the Church of Rome, up at least to 1848, to put herself right with the friends of European progress. Other honest people when they fail in any duty confess their faults, and resolve to amend; but when Rome is about to change her course, she is then most anxious to persuade all men that what she desires to be she now is and always has been. Balmez quotes from Thomas Aquinas and other Doctors of the Middle Ages, generous sentiments respecting the relations of kings and their subjects, such as do honour to their individual sagacity and Christian feeling, just because so much at variance with the scenes of violence and oppression around them. But these sentiments cost their authors nothing more than the ink that penned them, and no more prove the Romish Church to have originated, or to have worked out the constitutional and legal freedom of modern Europe, than the sagacious hints of Roger Bacon on optics, or those of the Marquis of Worcester on the possible uses of steam, prove the ingenious speculators to have been the inventors of telescopes or our modern steam engines. It had, indeed, been wonderful if church theologians, in the thousand years of the Middle Ages, had not uttered some generous sentiments and enlarged views on our social relations. More wonderful

still, if the clergy had so thoroughly forgot their Christian calling or lost all sympathy with the common people, from whom most of them sprung, as not to have often used their church power to protect their oppressed flocks against the bad chiefs and sovereigns of that singular period. Yet Guizot has shrewdly remarked, "that when the question of political guarantees has arisen between power and liberty, when the question was to establish a system of permanent institutions, which might truly place liberty beyond the invasions of power, the Church has generally ranged on the side of despotism." Nay, those guarantees which almost every European nation, and none more than Spain, inherited from its ancestors in the form of a Cortes, Parliament, or States-General, the sovereigns of Europe were permitted to extinguish, one by one, unresisted and unbuked, by the Papacy; and their restoration, in modern times, has been the work of the laity alone. In our day, indeed, we have been startled by the sight and sound of democratic priests, and even by a vision of a liberal Pope. Rome attempted to run with the "horsemen," and has suffered mortification. Some imagine that she has now turned for ever from the sovereign people she lately courted, to the sovereign princes. We believe no such thing. Rome, like other churches, was alarmed, and felt that order and security are the first necessities of society; but when the present reaction against popular excesses is over, she will endeavour to keep pace, at least, with the "footmen," in European politics and progress, working in her service as best she can an advancing civilisation too world wide now to be arrested.

This work of Balmez, in the style of its defence, proves that even Rome advances in her ideas. In spite of herself we see her giving up her old refuges, and betaking herself to new ones. Call it progress, or only adaptation, or what you will, Balmez admits what no former advocate of Rome would have admitted, and, by a certain superiority to his predecessors, seeks to commend his reasonings to a more favourable attention from intelligent minds. He adapts himself to the new era of the Spanish mind that has arisen in his own day. Instead of representing the English Reformation as the accident of Henry the Eighth's amours, or the German of Luther's monkish jealousies of the Dominicans, he confesses that "that which is general must have general causes, and that which is lasting must have lasting and profound causes." He admits the necessity of Church Reform in the sixteenth century. He tells us he does not like describing Pro-

testantism as "a great movement for the liberty of the human mind." Yet he confesses, "that the principle of submission to authority in matters of faith has always encountered a vigorous resistance in the human mind;" and the higher moral tone of the man and his finer intelligence promise a more than usually fair and reasonable treatment of the great question of the comparative civilizing powers and results of Protestantism and Romanism.

But Romanism or the Papacy are not the phrases the Abbé Balmez chooses to employ. He never once uses these appropriate and distinctive names for his Church system. He prefers stating the question which he discusses as one between Catholicity and Protestantism. The reader will take up this book expecting to find a comparison between the civilizing effects of whatever may be fairly described as peculiar and appertaining to the Papal Church system, and whatever may be fairly described as peculiar and appertaining to the leading Churches of the Reformation. This is the question in which Spain, Europe, the world, is interested. This question Balmez seems to discuss, yet he leads his reader into quite another, by the use of the epithet *Catholic*. Assuming that this epithet belongs exclusively to the Church of Rome, and "*Catholic*" being held as synonymous with *Christian*, the course of his argument may be easily imagined. Whatever Christianity has done for elevating the social condition of Europe, in the course of fifteen centuries, has been done by Catholicism, that is by Romanism, that is by the Papacy—Catholic, Roman, Papal, Christian, being all one and the same thing. Save, therefore, for sundry digressions and applications to Protestantism in the course of his reasonings, this work had been more truly designated "Christianity compared with Paganism and Islamism in its Effects on the Civilisation of Europe." The work is a satisfactory refutation, if such were needed, of the pretensions of those religious systems. But this is not the question Balmez wishes his readers to hold in their minds, nor yet the conclusion to which he would bring them. After setting before us many pleasing evidences of the effects of Christianity under the Empire and among the barbarians that overran it, he thus addresses Protestant Churches:—

"We may be allowed, in conclusion, to inquire of the Protestant Churches, of those ungrateful daughters who, after having quitted the bosom of their mother, attempt to calumniate and dishonour her, where were you when the Catholic Church accomplished in Europe the immense work of the abolition of slavery? and

how can you venture to reproach her with sympathizing with servitude, degrading man, and usurping his rights? Can you, then, present any claim which thus entitles you to the gratitude of the human race? What part can you claim in that great work which prepared the way for the development and grandeur of European civilization? Catholicism alone, without your concurrence, completed the work; and she alone would have conducted Europe to its lofty destinies, if you had not come to interrupt the majestic march of its mighty nations, by urging them to a path bordered by precipices, a path the end of which is concealed by darkness which the eye of God alone can pierce."—P. 81.

Such a taunt really merits no other reply than an Irish peasant is said to have given to the very similar one—"Where was your Church before Luther?" "Where was your reverence's face before it was washed this morning?" It may be that a thorough-bred Romanist priest finds great difficulty in conceiving of the priority of the *Principles* to the *Protest* of the Reformation. But Protestants believe, and it forms the very essence of their *Protest*, that their principles were those of the Christian Church in all times, *minus* the ecclesiastical system and superstitions built up around them in the course of ages; or, to use the figure of the Irish peasant—Protestantism is the Church of the Middle Ages, with its face well washed.

The real question, then, between Protestantism and the Papacy is, whether those *deeper* and *broader* foundations, by which European civilisation is distinguished both from the Ancient and the Eastern civilisations, have sprung from principles and practices in any way *peculiar to and distinctive of the Papacy*. Father Balmez does not pretend to connect the superior place and consideration of women in modern Europe, or the higher respect for the rights of the individual man, or any of the other characteristic features of European civilisation, with the worship of the Virgin, or any other form of saint-worship,—far less with the use of images, crosses, relics, or any of the mere externals by which Rome stands distinguished from Protestantism. Like every reader of the New Testament he finds them in those words of "grace and truth" that fell from the lips of the Son of God, or in the teachings of his Apostles. He must also admit that "the hope full of immortality," that enables men to overcome the violence of the passions, is pre-eminently the teaching of Holy Scripture. So far, therefore, Romanism, as a distinctive system, has no exclusive claim to have laid the broader and deeper foundations of our modern and European civilisation. Nay, one

of the very protests of the Reformation is against the exclusion of the mass of the people from the free use of those Scriptures which, the more they were known, the more European society must have been leavened beneficially by their influence. How, then, does Father Balmez contrive to connect Romanism exclusively with such social developments? Let us hear his own pleading:—

“We must observe, that ideas, however powerful they may be, have only a precarious existence until they are realized, and become embodied, as it were, in an institution, which, while it is animated, moved, and guided by them, serves them as a rampart against the attacks of other ideas and other interests.”—P. 127.

There is truth here. The Christian society needed organization and government, and the stronger the better, if suited to its nature. Father Balmez, exulting in the superior strength of his Church organization, exclaims,—

“What would Protestantism have effected in such difficult and dangerous circumstances? without authority, without a centre of action, without security for her own faith, without confidence in her resources, what means would she have had to assist her in restraining the torrent of violence—that impetuous torrent, which after having inundated the world, was about to destroy the remains of ancient civilisation, and opposed to all attempts at social reorganization an obstacle almost insurmountable? Catholicism, with its ancient faith, its powerful authority, its undivided unity, its well compacted hierarchy, was able to undertake the lofty enterprise of improving manners; and it brought to the undertaking that constancy which is inspired by conscious strength, and that boldness which animates a mind that is secure of triumph.”—P. 139.

This is more sensible and more tenable ground, than to ask where Protestantism was before the protest of Spire? When God ceased to water the plant of Christianity by miracles, means, systematic, powerful, and pervading were required, without which good principles must have remained for ever only good principles. But the question is, what were the means, at once legitimate and powerful, for carrying gospel principles into the heart of society, and ultimately seating them in its manners, laws, and institutions? The means most suitable to civil government may be most fatal to the ends of a Christian Church. The gospel is not a scheme for governing men from without, but for *imparting to them the power of self-government within themselves*—of bestowing on them principles, and motives, and habits

that shall make the smallest possible amount of external force necessary to society. Its highest success is, therefore, attained just as it renders all physical violence superfluous, by lifting the subject of its efforts into the condition of a self-guided, self-governed, Christian man. The church of Christ, therefore, was entrusted not with great *political powers*, but with great *spiritual truths and hopes*. It was not even the miracles of the first age that then changed men and society, but the gospel manifested to their consciences and hearts. “Because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness,” its right hand achieved terrible things. Its might was “the might of weakness.” Christianity seen and heard and, like its Divine Head, lifted upon the cross, drew men after it. It enlightened, persuaded, entreated men, warmed their hearts with new emotions, and, by its new hopes, furnished new springs of action, as well as new and powerful restraints. As our Lord said to the woman of Samaria, “The water that I shall give him, shall be in him a *well of water*.” Not a refreshing draught only such as philosophy gives; nor a cistern such as life’s innocent pleasures may yield, but a perennial fountain in the soul of the individual man, and in the society of which he constitutes a part.

Such was gospel power. The legitimate instruments for doing its work were the same as at the beginning, the teaching and preaching of the lessons of the gospel; and its legitimate organizations were for the better working of these into the head and heart of society. The church system of the third and fourth centuries, as it added one round after another to the hierarchical ladder, was mighty too, but it was no longer “the might of weakness”—nor were its triumphs only “because of truth, and meekness, and righteousness.” It lost its simply spiritual character, and entered into combination with all manner of worldly elements and influences, which ere long overmastered it. It was no longer “all of gold,” but like the image seen in vision by Nebuchadnezzar, mixed with baser materials, even to the iron and the clay. In the fifth century, Paganism was vanquished as a power. The Christian Church had become that of the Empire. Her bishops were more potent, in their several dioceses, than the representatives of the Emperors, and the church had no enemy but herself. We are far from saying that this church, which triumphed over Paganism, did nothing for the Roman Empire worthy of her origin. The gospel was still in her, though mixed with base materials. She could not suddenly nor easily forget what she had been and was designed to be.

Doubtless she did many things to soften the manners, elevate the sentiments, and soothe the sorrows of mankind. Many poor felt her protection from the oppressor, and were relieved by her charities; and many of the rich and powerful were awed into justice, and softened into humanity. But the broad fact remains, that as she became powerful to govern, she became powerless to better men—like the perfect gentleman of modern times—

“having finished his house
He sells his estate.”

When the Church had finished her ecclesiastical house, she was not far from spiritual bankruptcy. The connexion between the two things was more than one of time, not unlike the connexion observed by the old English peasant between the erection of Tenterden Steeple and the progress of Goodwin Sands. The house she built was indeed spacious and magnificent; but in the process of erection, how much of the soul and strength of the Church, as a spiritual institute, had disappeared in that work—how much of the bread of the children had been turned into worse than stones! The top of the ecclesiastical edifice seemed more than ever to point to heaven, but less than ever drew down heaven's influences to raise a fallen world, or preserve a falling empire from ruin. What a melancholy return history gives of the civilizing effects of this hierarchical Church! Civilizing effects! Why, though triumphant over Paganism, she could not even preserve from continual decay, the civilisation that had grown up under Paganism. If it be alleged that this decay was not caused by the Church; neither, we reply, was it prevented by the Church. Yet her all-powerful priesthood had the sole forming of the mind and heart of successive generations before the fall of the Empire, had access to all ranks and classes, had in its hand the heaven inspired volume, and its claim to be the only healer of the moral diseases of the world was allowed on all sides. So wide spread, so powerful, so strong, and so secure in her position,—did this Church pour into the social body the elements of a higher intellectual and moral life, and prepare the world for a higher and happier civilisation on the broad basis of the gospel? Did she even infuse health enough and vigour enough, to countervail the elements of decay that were at work in the Roman world? Or shall we believe that Christianity itself was at fault, *that* Christianity which so enlarged the understandings, and nerved while it purified the hearts of its first converts, enabling

them to push the Christian enterprise beyond the range of the military conquests of Rome? No! the gospel had lost none of its power, but the Church, as she perfected her ecclesiastical system, had been losing hold of the gospel. The healer of the nations required healing herself. She had either ceased to be a teacher in any true sense, or taught what the Apostle Paul would have called “another gospel.” If ever human society needed wise teaching and training to avert temporal ruin, it was Roman society in the 3d and 4th centuries. But what it most needed it least got. Roman society needed the aid of the head, hearts, and hands of all her ablest and best—but the Church was busy teaching a higher perfection than that of faithfully and painfully discharging the duties of our private and public stations in life. Society needed more than ever the cultivation of all the *active* virtues, but the Church was bestowing exaggerated praises and over cultivation on the *passive* virtues. The highest religious life was no longer that of doing for Christ and our brethren, but of dreaming of the life of angels and saints above; no longer life in action, but in suffering self-inflicted penances, in solitary musings, and perpetual psalmody. The men were turned into women, when there was need that even the women should be turned into men: and, under ecclesiastical teaching, the women became aught but Roman mothers or “guides of the house.” Under Church training, each generation became more imbecile and helpless; and when the day of danger came, the generation born and bred under this hierarchical Church was unable to defend its altars and hearths from desecration and pillage.

Such is the estimate of history. Whatever the Nicene Church system effected in particular cases, or whatever great and good men it produced, they were exceptional, and worked their Christian work through a Church system becoming, in each generation, less capable of doing real Christian work. If it was a system good for the clergy it was bad for the people, because not only unprogressive, but not even conservative of the pre-existent civilisation.*

* Guizot has shewn by comparison of the rules of St. Anthony, the patriarch of the monastic system of the Empire, and those of St. Benedict, the patriarch of the western monks after its fall, that Benedict's was a reform of the monastic system of the Nicene Church, and as such was sanctioned by the Papacy. The monastic system has undergone repeated reforms, adapting itself to the times. Rome does advance, though by slow steps,—“one step a century,” said Luther, in a caricature of Rome's promised reforms which he published.

To the thousand years of European history that succeeded from the fifth to the sixteenth century, Balmez more confidently appeals. There, indeed, the advocates of Rome must stand strong if anywhere in all history. Europe to herself, and an entire millennium of time to work in, it had been wonderful if she had not done many things worthy of being mentioned with honour. To learn what these things are, the work of Balmez may be read with instruction by all who would not willingly remain ignorant of the blessings as well as the blows which Rome has inflicted on European civilisation.

On the fall of the Empire, having to do only with barbarous tribes and their chiefs, the Church felt her superiority in all but arms. Naturally, inevitably, for self-preservation, if not from higher motives, she became their civilizer—the Empire being now “taken out of the way.” The Papacy arose, developing and making good its pretensions as head of the Church Hierarchy, and spiritual ruler of the world. The Church under the “Papacy” took to herself a wider range and greater powers, and put forth a long and strong arm both for good and evil. The Church that could not add to nor even preserve the civilisation of the Empire, could add much to the Goths and Vandals, the Franks and Burgundians that overran it. Unable to teach civilized men she might well be able to instruct these children of nature. In them the *active* energies of our nature were no longer in *defect* but in excess, and might well be softened and regulated by those very institutions which before only enervated society and hastened the dissolution of the Empire. The Church, as if taught by experience, adapted her religious institutes to the more active qualities of her conquerors. In the middle ages arose the religious orders of the Knights of St. James, in Spain, and of the Templars and Hospitallers, whose life, like the modern Jesuit, was spent in action, and whose hopes of Heaven were not in the passive virtues of the martyr, but in deeds of valour and military prowess on the side of the Church. Fighting prelates and warlike religious orders abound in the middle ages, and in fostering Christian chivalry the Church shewed herself equally anxious to reward valour and to guide its enterprises. It has been remarked also, as an important element of power in her Millennial reign, that, unlike the feudal system, in the midst of which she lived, the Church of the middle ages never became a *caste*, but remained a corporation, ever renewing its youth and attaching to its ranks the talents and capacity

of each generation. A Church so constituted and so circumstanced must have become still more powerful for good had the fall of the Western Empire, which placed her helpless before the barbarians, been felt as an intimation to trust no more in worldly devices, but to cast herself anew on her first principles and practices. We have seen in our day and in our own land, that wherever, along with other elements of civilisation, the Gospel has been purely taught and widely disseminated through the mass of society, it has wrought out a deeper, and wider, and happier civilisation. Had the Church of the middle ages felt this higher calling, the Christian Church had perhaps been a less thing in history, but the Gospel had been a far greater and deeper thing in the heart of European society; much suffering past, and we fear also to come, might have been spared to mankind; and though, doubtless, there might have been strifes and contentions manifold, as there have been in the last three centuries, yet truth would have surely worked itself clear from the fermentations of a thousand years; we might have now seen the things we still long to see, and beheld an earlier and more genial spring of Christian civilisation set in, which long ere this Europe had felt in all her borders.

Instead of “this more excellent way,” a Church system more cunningly devised than that of the Empire arose. The Gospel was accommodated to the barbarians instead of the barbarians being lifted up to the Gospel. External forms and ceremonies were multiplied to attract the curiosity and exalt the wonder of the spectators. Christianity ceased to be “the religion of the Book,” or to be propagated by teaching and preaching its lessons. The Gothic kings and chiefs were not so much taught as baptized into Christianity; and their retainers followed to baptism on so large a scale, that the Church had recourse to wholesale rites, and besprinkled crowds with baptismal mops.* The influence the Church thus obtained it undoubtedly used for their civilisation. The numerous councils, general and national, of the middle ages, were as frequent as they were afterwards rare. Between the years 752 and 987, that is, in 235 years, not fewer than 201 councils, national and general, may be enumerated, that is nearly one every year. In these councils the enactments were civil as well as ecclesi-

* The mop was used in Spain, even in the 15th century, for baptizing the crowds of Jews who, under the compulsion of baptism or banishment, preferred the easier. See “Prescott’s History of Ferdinand and Isabella,” vol. ii. p. 134.

astical, embracing all social relations and interests; and abundantly attest the deep interest the clergy of the middle ages felt in the ascendancy of law and justice, when these had few other guardians. To the clergy is undoubtedly due the merit of having early given forth not only enactments favourable to the emancipation of the serfs, that is of the great mass of the population of Europe, but of showing the example by emancipating those on the estates of the Church. On these pleasing facts Balmez dwells with natural satisfaction. They shew that the Church had never wholly forgotten her calling to do good to mankind—that the worst Christian Church is better than no Church; and when we behold Christianity working out those social changes, and laying those broader foundations for European civilisation, when its lessons were reduced almost to the *minimum* of Gospel truths and precepts, we are tempted to exclaim, how much more still it had done if more generously ministered, not only for the emancipation from serfdom, but for the development, intellectual, moral, and social, of the European mass.

We have already said that the monastic institutions under the Papacy were a reform on those under the empire. These institutions were also the nurseries of all the learning of the time, the preservers and multipliers of books. It may be more new to some of our readers to learn that in the middle ages there were also monastic orders that fulfilled the functions of our modern emancipation or anti-slavery societies. Let us give honour to whom honour is due. One instance we shall select out of several, as an illustration of the kind of service Europe got in the middle ages from what may be fairly ascribed to her Papal and monastic system. Balmez mentions it only in general terms; but as affording the most favourable possible view of monastic services in the middle ages, we shall offer an abridged account from the Roman Breviary, and Butler's Lives of the Saints.

John of Matha is one of the saints of the Romish calendar. His memory is honoured on the 8th of February. He was born about 1169 in Provence. He was the founder of the first religious order in Europe that devoted itself to the redemption of Christian captives from slavery. So early had the idea of becoming an instrument in this good work taken possession of his mind, that when, as a priest, he celebrated his first mass, he saw visions of captive Christians and Moorish oppressors, and angels in white pointing to them as objects of his pity. Meeting with a hermit of a kin-

dred spirit, they kindled each other's zeal in their solitude, until solitude and its inactivity became intolerable, when they set out together to Rome, to realize, if possible, their benevolent idea. Innocent III., the same Pope that frightened king John into doing him homage for his crown, was sovereign pontiff. He was sovereign enough to see that good might be done to humanity, and honour gained to the Papal See, by patronizing such useful enthusiasm. At first he doubted and hesitated, but the more he saw of the men, and understood their object, the more his benevolence and interest was awakened, and being personally favoured with like visions of captives and angels, he gave the Papal approbation, and created "The Order of the Most Holy Trinity for the Redemption of Captives." Instituted with or without visions, this order became a real service to humanity, and the parent of similar orders under other designations. Matha became the general of this order, which was felt to be a great blessing in Europe. In a generation it could enumerate 250 monasteries, of which England alone contained 43, Scotland 9, and Ireland, it is said, 52 houses. Matha himself, in his first voyage to the coast of Barbary, in a vessel which he fitted out by the aid of the charitable, redeemed 186 Christian slaves. The following year at Tunis he purchased the liberty of 110 more, by funds which his order had begged over Europe. In Spain he redeemed many from captivity amongst the Moors, and everywhere gathered alms for this truly Christian object. The rule of the order was to devote a *third* part of its regular revenues to the redemption of captives, in addition, we imagine, to what it procured for this special purpose from the charity of Europe, of which, along with Nolascoe's order of Mercy, they became the almoners. If an Englishman in the middle ages had a relative taken captive in the Mediterranean by the Moors, he applied to one of the houses of this order, which having correspondents throughout Europe, was bound by its vows to see to his redemption, or to go into captivity in his room.

So long as work of this kind was needed and was really done by this order, or its after imitators, they deserved the respect and gratitude of mankind. In that age the Church, and the Church alone, with its widespread brotherhoods, could accomplish what is now better done by ambassadors and consuls, negotiation and commercial intercourse.

Such were some of the services the Church of the middle ages rendered to civilisation and humanity. Wherein, then, did she fail

as a civilizer? If by civilisation we understand the development of the *whole* man, head, heart, and hands, individually and socially, then the Papal Church system has signally failed, both in the quantity and quality of the Christian teaching and training she gave to the *individual* man. She emancipated the European serf in his body, but she left his spirit bound. In loosing him from the feudal chain she fastened only the deeper on his soul the ecclesiastical one. We know the Romanist will say that this was his highest freedom, because the voice of the Church is the voice of God; but as Protestants we believe it was only substituting one human yoke for another—one more moral, no doubt, of a finer quality and higher elements—yet a yoke that entered far deeper into his soul, under which, though personally free, the mass of the people of Europe never attained to any consciousness of mental freedom, or acquired any use of the nobler faculties God had given them. Whether the Church yoke of the middle ages was a divine or a human one, it was a crushing yoke to the human faculties. The European serf attained only the smallest amount of intellectual and moral culture. Whether her great power was of heaven or of earth, blight and barrenness there were under the Church tuition of many centuries: men, it has been happily said, rather *felt* the light of Christianity, as a blind man feels the warmth of the sun or the approach of a candle, than saw it with their eyes. A certain Christian influence society felt, yet the individual man felt but little and saw still less. Who can help asking how different, at this hour, had been the state of Europe, had Rome, as she helped the masses out of personal thralldom, introduced them to “the light and liberty of the gospel?”

How little she did or tried to do for the layman, or the masses of laymen, in the middle ages, various facts might illustrate. We shall mention only one, but it is one of so broad a character as to cover the whole of our subject. There exists to this day in the Pope's chapel, the Sixtine, the custom of presenting to him the chalice, with a golden calamus or hollow reed, through which his holiness imbibes the sacramental wine. Whence originated this singular custom? It had been no recent one in the days of Charlemagne, who in 800 presented the Pope with a large chalice, and a syphon or tube. The calamus may therefore be regarded as the familiar and well known appendage of the chalice, in the days of that monarch and his immediate predecessors. Thereby hangs a tale of the Church management and barbaric Christianity of the fifth

and sixth centuries. The sacraments were represented as the great and sure means of salvation, and the barbarians were zealously invited to resort to them. Nor do they seem to have been loath to submit to conditions of salvation so easy. They came in such crowds to be baptized that the priests, after some scruples, had recourse to the device of a *mop* or *asperger* to generalize and abbreviate their labours. But it was much more difficult to know how to minister, without scandal, to crowds of barbarians the sacrament of the bread and of the wine-cup. One can imagine the scenes that must have occurred, and the perplexity of the Church in dealing with her unhallowed converts, who, without knowledge, were as yet also without those superstitious feelings which restrain the ignorant. If it was so in the Greek Church of Corinth, and required apostolic correction, how must it have been when the wine-cup was presented to hundreds and thousands of Goths and Vandals, Franks and Burgundians, converted at the bidding or by the example of their chiefs! Two remedies were open to the Church. To revert to first principles and practices, and as the Apostle did in a like emergency, instruct the people better in the nature of the Sacrament; but this required time and patience, and no small courage in keeping back the ignorant and refractory. The Church seems, therefore, to have taken a shorter way. She invented the calamus, an ingenious device that served many uses, that made excess very difficult by making it very tedious, that prevented the spilling of the sacred element, and by ministering it only in drops, economized the wine, and saved the revenues of the Church from an expense no Church could have borne, whilst it tended also to increase the superstitious reverence of the people. Any thing more ingenious could not have been imagined: but unsanctioned as it was by primitive usage, so curious an invention never could have been thought of, save under the force of some great necessity; yet, although generally introduced, it does not seem to have attained its object. The barbarians had, perhaps, seen through it, and shewn their impatience of the calamus and its wine drops; or some humourist had exercised his unhallowed wit upon it. It was unacceptable, or inefficacious, as a remedy for the disorder: and at last the Church, baffled in all her expedients, was obliged in the 12th century to withhold the cup from the laity altogether.*

* Our authority for the invention of the Calamus, is a work entitled, *Pontif. Mass.* By C. M. Baggs, D.D.; Camriere d'Onore to his Holiness. Published at Rome, 1840. Printed by Menaldi, pp. 33. De-

In the invention of the asperger for the baptism of crowds—in the conversion of the Sacramental bread into a wafer of the smallest dimensions; and, above all, in this withdrawal of the cup from the laity after this abortive attempt to regulate its use, we have a graphic picture of the quantity and quality of the teaching of Rome in the middle ages. How expressive of a Church system more intent upon governing men, than making them wise and good—that did something for society at large, but next to nothing for the individual—incapable or unwilling to work Christianity into the hearts of men, and by elevating its individual members to prepare the way for the higher civilisation of a self-governed Christian society in Europe.

But no satisfactory comparison can be instituted between the civilizing effects of Protestantism and Romanism, until these two elements separate at the Reformation. Up to that period, they ran together in the same ecclesiastical channel, commingling and acting on each other, as well as on the world. What was due to the one element, and what to the other, will ever be a matter of variance. The Romanist also, mistaking the organic unity of his Church for a spiritual unity, is unable or unwilling to allow that any such element of disunion as Protestantism could have any existence in her bosom prior to the Reformation, although that event had not a few forerunners throughout Europe: but all this inability or affectation of it ends with the Reformation, when these elements separate and flow apart in their ecclesiastical and national channels.

Two nations instantly suggest themselves as the best possible illustrations of the comparative civilizing effects of these elements—Spain and Great Britain. Let us recall, then, what Spain possessed of civilisation before the Reformation. From her Visigoth ancestors she inherited constitutional liberties better developed, and apparently more secure, than those of any other European nation. So early as 1169, Castile had

scribed the ceremonies of the Sixtine Chapel, he says,—“The cardinal deacon now hands the chalice to the Pope: M. Sagrista gives the *Calamo* or *fistola* to the assistant cardinal bishops, who present it to the Pope. His Holiness putting it into the chalice, receives through it a part of the sacred blood.” In a note he adds, “This is one of the many ancient customs preserved in the pontifical ceremonies. The *Laity*, as we learn from the *Ordo Romanus*, and other documents, used formerly to receive the sacred blood through the *calamo*, *lest it should be spilt*. This practice, of course, ceased, when communion under one kind became prevalent about the 12th century. Among the presents made to Churches, we find mentioned from the *seventh* century and afterwards, gold, silver, ivory, and even the *calami*, *cannæ*, *fistulæ*, *pugillares* or *virgulæ*, names which all have the same meaning.”

its Cortes, exercising a degree of power superior to any other European legislature. No tax could be imposed without its consent. It watched over the administration of justice, nominated regencies, settled questions of the succession to the crown, and enacted laws. The constitutional liberties of Aragon and Catalonia were still more extensive. The doctrine was openly maintained in the 12th and 13th centuries, that monarchs should be deposed for infringing the liberties of their subjects, and that the good of the Commonwealth is paramount to that of the Prince. By a statute of 1307, the Convocation of the Cortes was biennial; it had before been annual. The great officers of the crown were jealously excluded. No law was valid, no tax imposed without its consent. The precise application of each tax was decreed, and the power was unservedly exercised of withholding the supplies. The Justiciary, or first Judge of the land was irremovable, unless by consent both of King and Cortes; and when the monarch of Aragon was crowned, he knelt bare-headed, whilst the Justiciary stood covered, and administered the oath for the protection of the national liberties—a proud emblem, says Prescott,* of the superiority of law to prerogative in Aragon. The Aragonese historians “exult,” says the same writer, in the fearless administration of justice to all classes, and the legislature itself declared “that their liberties more than counterbalanced the poverty of the nation, and the sterility of their soil.” Under their protection, and her own municipal privileges, Barcelona rose to be a first-rate commercial city, trading with Syria and Egypt, as well as with the northern nations of Europe, and had the honour in 1401 of establishing the first Bank of Exchange and deposit in Europe and of compiling the first code of maritime laws.

Besides this inheritance from Gothic ancestors, Spain, on the conquest of Granada, entered into possession of the richest civilisation in letters and philosophy then in the world. The empire of the Arabs in Spain lasted from the eighth to the fifteenth century, almost 800 years. During several centuries, unlike all other Mahometan nations, the Spanish Arabs cultivated philosophy, letters, and the arts, with national ardour and enthusiasm. The young princes of the blood, instead of being consigned to the education of the harem, as in Turkey, were sent to the Academies, and entered into competition for literary honours. Cordova

* See the interesting History by Prescott, a work full of interest. 2 vols., 1839.

alone contained 80 free schools; 50 schools could be enumerated over Granada; 70 public libraries were enumerated in Spain at the beginning of the fourteenth century. One of the Spanish Caliphs, Alhakem, collected, at a vast cost, a magnificent library of many thousand (Prescott says, of 600,000) volumes, from Egypt, Syria, and Persia, at a time when a first-rate European monastery would have thought 400 volumes a large collection. That this is not all exaggeration is proved by the remains of Moorish magnificence, which to this day are the most striking objects of interest to the traveller in Spain. Still more by the catalogues of Arabian books in the Escorial, and the remains there of Arabian manuscripts, after being diminished by a fire. These prove that philosophy and literature, in all its branches, had been cultivated, especially natural science, mathematics, and astronomy. Under the Spanish Arabs, the Monk Gilbert studied arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. On his return to France he wrote on these subjects, was esteemed a prodigy, and in spite of the imputation of necromancy, he was raised in the tenth century to the Papal Chair, under the name of Sylvester II. The treatises on logic and metaphysics amount to one-ninth of the surviving treatises of the Escorial. To the Arabians of Spain we owe the rudiments of our modern arithmetic and algebra, of our pharmacy and chemistry, and all this when, according to King Alfred, "scarcely a priest south of the Thames could translate Latin in his mother tongue."

As cultivators of the soil and merchants, the Arabs of Spain were no less a-head of the rest of Europe. They wrote voluminous treatises on agriculture, and erected works for irrigating the fields of Granada that are magnificent even in their ruins. They introduced the sugar-cane from the East. Six hundred of their villages were occupied in the silk manufactory alone. They re-opened the mines whence the Romans had got their gold, and supplied Europe with the precious metals before the discovery of South America. In one district alone, that of Jaen, not fewer than 5000 Moorish excavations have been traced. Such was the reputation of the Moors for industry and enterprise, that it was the favourite saying of one of the bishops of Granada, who had been confessor to Queen Isabella, that Moorish works and Spanish faith were all that were necessary to make a good Christian. This civilisation reached far into the fourteenth century, and embraced a period of 600 years. It is all the more remarkable that it had arisen without any encouragement from the Koran,

which, unlike the Christian books, demands little ancient learning for its illustration. Yet, remarkable as it is, no fact seems better attested than that the Moors of Spain, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, valued, to use their own expression, the ink of those doctors, as the Christians did the blood of their martyrs.

In her efforts to subjugate the Moors, Spain was also consolidated into one kingdom, and trained to common enterprises. The discovery of America gave ample scope for the national energy awakened in the Moorish wars, and by her enterprises both in the Old and New World, in the fifteenth century, Spain stood at the head of European nations.

Is it needful to describe the change that has come over Spain during the last 300 years? We had gathered from French, American, and English travellers some notices of what she is in our day when seen by other eyes than her own, but we forbear. The fact is but too certain that Spain has fallen. Does Father Balmez deny this? Far from it: he writes of his country in the tone of one conscious that he is living amidst ruins,—“We have nothing left unfortunately but great recollections: let us at least avoid despising them.”—P. 173. Yet, forgetting the patriot in the priest, he exclaims against Guizot for saying, that in England the Jesuits have destroyed kings, and in Spain the people,—“I wish the great publicist had explained to us to what great disaster he alluded. To what period does he allude? I have examined our history; and I do not find this destruction which was caused by the Jesuits: I cannot imagine whereon the historian fixed his eyes when he pronounced these words.”

We do not easily find that which we do not like. Father Balmez assures us that “the history of the last three centuries is about to be restored, and the truth placed in its true light.” The Spanish Church will doubtless employ, if it has not already, the most skillful hand in this *restoration*. The work will be widely circulated and royally patronized, become a text-book at Salamanca and in all the rising schools of the Spanish Jesuits. Father Balmez helps us to anticipate how this restoration will be gone about. *Post hoc* is not *propter hoc*, will be repeated until it is almost believed by reiteration, and the authority of the Church advanced that what goes before never is and never can be the cause of that which follows after, and that Mother Church, harmless as a dove, has received many blows but inflicted none. Providence, fate, accident, misfortune, blundering statesmen, degenerate nobles, ay, even

kings, will not be spared, so that the Spanish Church be made out to have been always and only a blessing.

Yet never did any nation so surrender herself to the counsels and church system of Rome, and never did Romish Churchmen so long prevail in the counsels of any nation. At the suggestion of Romish Churchmen, Spain established, in 1483, the Inquisition, granting it powers and privileges as yet unknown in any other European nation. On the Jews, the Spanish Inquisition tried its apprentice-hand. Until then that people had enjoyed more toleration in Spain than in any other part of Europe, and had grown in numbers, wealth, and consideration. Their conversion was attempted by fines, confiscation, imprisonment, and torture, and considerable progress was made; but it seemed too slow and uncertain, and the Spanish Church advised their expulsion. A royal edict went forth that deprived Spain of 160,000 of her most industrious and peaceful subjects, and converted those that remained into cringing hypocrites, broken in character and spirit, a moral sore in the nation.

In 1502, at the suggestion and urgent entreaties of no less a person than Cardinal Ximenes, Spain violated her solemn treaties with the conquered Moors, and left them to the mercies of the Inquisition. Nay, the Spanish Church, not content with the rate and rapidity of conversions by that tribunal, at length urged Ferdinand and Isabella to decree their final and complete expulsion from Spain. The best of the Moors were thus banished, and the remainder sank, like the Jews, into cringing hypocrites, broken in character and spirit, another moral sore in the heart of Spain. Thus, a second time obedient to Church councils of perfection, Spain let out a portion of her life-blood, or corrupted what remained, and a second blow was inflicted on her arts, industry, and commerce, akin to that which France afterwards inflicted on herself in the expulsion of the Huguenots and revocation of the Edict of Nantes.

The Inquisition began with Jews and Moors. It now turned its hand against the Spanish nation. The heresy of the Reformation was indeed easily extinguished in blood and amidst national congratulations. That accomplished, the Inquisition sat down, like an incubus, on the heart of the nation, diffusing everywhere unknown fears and suspicion, crushing all intellectual as well as all moral freedom. It raged equally against books and men, against whatsoever was or pretended to be wiser in any matter, civil or religious, than itself. Freedom of thought,

the old spirit of inquiry, the old love of philosophy and letters that had sprung up in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, cribbed and fettered on all sides, shrunk and shrivelled up into the mummy of its former self. Even the military and commercial spirit felt the same withering blast. The Spanish nation became bigoted to the last degree: those that were not so became cringing and hypocritical. "The iron entered her soul." The once enterprising and high-spirited Spain retired within herself, and built up a wall of separation from the whole European world. The Romish Church was triumphant, but it was over the Spanish nation. Spain stood beneath her ecclesiastical masters obedient, but bereft of courage, capacity, and intelligence to act her part in the European world: "a nation of heroes transformed into a nation of hens:" commerce and the arts decayed: the State betrayed by her own princes and nobles: and the Spanish hidalgo as much changed from the hidalgoes that conquered Granada, as the gospel of her priesthood was changed from the Gospel of Christ and his Apostles.

If Jesuitism may be described as the most perfect development of the Church system of Rome, Spain may be regarded as the most perfect development of its national results. A nation may gather strength from religious dissensions, for they awaken the faculties, and train men to reason and judge more shrewdly in their temporal affairs. A nation may develop her resources, and advance her civilisation amidst bloody and expensive wars. A few years pass away, and the severest visitation of pestilence and famine is forgotten. But priestly despotism enters the soul of a nation, puts out the eyes of its victim, and deadens it to the very consciousness of its misery. Could we suppose it, like blind Samson, to awaken to the sense of its wrongs, like him it would utter its natural wailings in strains not unlike those which our great poet has put into his mouth—

—————"I, dark in light, exposed
To daily fraud, contempt, abuse, and wrong,
Within doors and without, still as a fool,
In power of others, never in my own:
Scarce half I seemed to live, dead more than
half;
O, dark, dark, dark, amid the blaze of noon;
Irrecoverably dark; total eclipse,
Without all hope of day!"

Priestly despotism arrested the civilisation of Egypt, the first of ancient nations. It has arrested India for ages. It could not even preserve the civilisation of the Roman empire, though Roman society had recently

received into its bosom a new revelation of which it was the sole minister. It first promoted the civilisation of the middle ages of Europe, but arrested that civilisation the moment it was about to break from its leading strings. It has left modern France after half a century of revolutions, destitute of the mental and moral discipline needful to exercise and preserve a legal and well ordered liberty; and it has made the sun of Spain to go back, since the Reformation, many "degrees in the dial plate."

It is unnecessary to prosecute the comparison between Spanish and British progress, since the Reformation. Whatever may have been the shortcomings of our Protestant Churches, Established or Dissenting, none of them have been such miserable educators of the nation as the Spanish Church. An Englishman may love his Church more warmly than wisely, but even in his love he is "a subject, not a slave." As a nation, we have learned loyalty without servility. Our nobility are the richest in Europe, yet we honour them and trust them as no other nobles are honoured and trusted, because their wealth has not yet enervated them; and we see them taking a manly part in the senate and in the field, as the leaders of our national defence and social improvements. We have a numerous, active, and intelligent middle class, rejoicing in their strength and self-reliance. We see a numerous and increasing class of educated and moral workmen pressing hard on their steps, seeking more and more education for themselves and their children, and securing a larger measure of the comforts and advantages of our civilisation. If we have still a large class without character and without comfort, of whom we cannot speak but in sorrow and shame, we have become fully conscious of its existence, and are now seeking the remedies, which are evidently not one but many. These remedies will, we doubt not, be found out and applied with national energy and perseverance, until the blessings of British civilisation are shared by the humblest, and the foundations of British prosperity obtain a social breadth and depth, as much greater than they have yet obtained, as they already exceed all ancient civilisations.

In speaking of Christianity and civilisation, and their relative action upon each other, and on nations, there has been a wonderful confusion of tongues; sometimes they have been treated as conspiring, sometimes as independent, and at other times as antagonistic forces. But under the term civilisation we include the development of the *whole* man, individual and social. In what

other light can the believer in Christianity regard the Gospel but as the means appointed by Him who knows our frame, to realize its finest moral development, both individually and socially. To ask, then, whether we may have civilisation without Christianity, is the same thing as to ask whether we may have the whole without *all its parts*; or to ask whether we may have the best development of man's moral nature without the use of the best means. Happily we may have a part of one nature developed without the whole. A high material civilisation has co-existed with a very small moral one, and even an intellectual development, of a high order, has too often been witnessed with a very low moral development. Ancient Athens was called "the Palace of Intellect," yet it was the sanctuary of Pagan idolatry and its attendant vices. In modern France, we have seen both a high intellectual and material civilisation divided from the moral. Ecclesiastical Rome glories in having, in her loved Italy, developed the fine arts, and the tastes which they cultivate, and consecrated them to the service of her ritual and sensuous worship. Yet what has she done for the intellectual development of the Italian people, and can an Italian be compared with a Scottish peasant, either in his intellectual or moral man? The world has seen many partial, mutilated, short-lived civilisations, short-lived, just because partial and mutilated. The civilisation that is destined to live and abide, is that which develops the *whole man*, which has therefore regard to all the elements of our complete nature, and uses all the means the Creator has provided, physical, intellectual, and moral,—which, above all, uses the Creator's own lessons in the Gospel, as its handmaid, in developing the moral man, in whose successful development alone we have any guarantees for the permanence of our material and intellectual civilisations. Hitherto we have been looking too much at bits and portions of human nature, as well as bits and portions of society, and dealing both with the individual man and the social body in detached parts. A more equal development both of the individual and of society, is as necessary to the well-being of society as harmony is to music. Is it not evident, from past history, that whatever may happen in an individual case, Christianity cannot on society at large be fully developed apart from certain material and intellectual conditions? How rarely does the *individual* man rise above his circumstances! *Masses* of men almost never. The finer growths of the intellect and moral feeling will not thrive in a material jungle;

and a wholesome mind cannot survive long in an unwholesome body. British philanthropists now aim at a universally educated, Christianized, well-conditioned community, down to the foot of British society; yet how many conditions must conspire to this great result! The art of printing, to multiply books. The art of reading, to make books available. An early and wide-spread intellectual education, to make books easy, agreeable, and intelligible reading. An order of men, separated as teachers of youth, and another as instructors of the risen generation in the lessons of the Gospel. These, in a state of society, where they can no longer be drones, but must work, work, work, all at it, and aye at it. All this presupposes a wise and a strong government, a powerful, public opinion, freely uttered, and widely diffused; and is this all? No! There must co-exist, also, a material civilisation that shall not leave human beings in animal debasement, either of person or dwelling, a prey to filth, fever, and the publican, else the social system, to its depths, will never be reached by our intellectual or moral civilisation, nor British society be civilized in the best sense of that word. When God calls our nobles and merchant princes, and willing-hearted people, to his foot to do this great thing, they "shall help every one his neighbour, and every one shall say to his brother, Be of good courage. The carpenter will encourage the goldsmith, and he that smootheth with the hammer, him that smote the anvil, saying, It is ready for soldering, and he that fastened it with the nails that it should not be moved."

Numerous and tempting are the topics that still remain. We can do no more than enumerate them. The missions of Rome have been prosecuted over the world, with an ardour and self-devotion that might well awaken the dulllest Protestants to what the Duke of Wellington is reported to have lately so happily called, their *marching orders*, "to go and preach the gospel to every living creature." The civilizing effect of these Romish missions is another matter, and would require an article of itself. The literary policy of Rome, since she was alarmed by the Reformation, is another large subject. Father Balmez has inadvertently characterized it, in characterizing the literary policy of Mahometanism, only substituting the word Church for the Alcoran.

"Their whole system, with respect to letters and intellectual cultivation, is founded on that stupid maxim, uttered by one of their chiefs, when he condemned an immense library to the flames, 'If their books are contrary to the Al-

coran, they should be burnt as pernicious; if they are not contrary to it, they should be burnt as useless.'"—P. 192.*

But we must draw our article to a close. It is impossible to read the work of Balmez without melancholy feelings. It is the production of a superior mind, intellectual, moral, of high and generous feelings, that loves to dwell on all that is elevating and inspiring in the Christian Church and her doings, believing sincerely that Romanism and Christianity are identical, and that through Rome alone, Spain can be saved from being gallicized. Yet this thoughtful man, with an intelligence far beyond the majority of Romish ecclesiastics, can descend to the following statement:—

"Protestantism has certainly never revealed to the world a single dogma which exalts the dignity of man, nor created fresh motives of consideration and respect, or closer bonds of fraternity. The Reformation cannot, therefore, boast of having given the *least* impetus to the progress of modern nations; it cannot consequently lay the least claim to the gratitude of the people in this respect."—P. 288.

"Has God any need of thy lie?" he exclaims as he closes his work. God has not—but Rome has and finds many, and these not always her least minds, equally ready to lie for her or to die for her. Protestantism never proposed to have revealed new truths, but only to have restored old ones, that lay buried or corrupted with associated errors, and by the work of *restoration*, brought the human heart and conscience once more into direct contact with the lessons of God.

It is more melancholy still to find this reviver of Spanish Philosophy and the Spanish Church, who acknowledges in the opening of his book, that "the weakest and most unworthy method of influencing men is force," and that "this wholesome truth Christianity has proclaimed," defending the Inquisition on the plea of necessity. "In the 16th century the introduction of Protestantism was imminent and inevitable without the system pursued by Philip II." His book gives no hope that the Spanish conquest of souls by the conquest of bodies may not be renewed in time convenient, or that Protestantism and Romanism, books or men, shall yet have a fair field to try conclusions in Spain. While we pen these

* In Mendham's literary policy of Rome, our readers will find ample details of Rome's rage against books, amounting to more destructiveness far, than Sultan Omer ever sanctioned, even if the Alexandrian Library were as large as it is fabled to have been.

words, the revived ascendancy of the Spanish Church, and her stern intolerance of every Protestant movement, is proclaimed in the recent correspondence between Her Majesty's late government and the present Spanish ministry, on the subject of a cemetery for the Protestants in Madrid. It is at length conceded, but with conditions which forbid the slightest religious act within its walls.

But we have done. Guizot has reproached Protestantism with not accepting more cordially the consequences of its own principles. The reproach is just. Each Protestant party thought division should stop with itself, and persecuted the new separatists. That blunder is now, however, at an end, we trust for ever. Some Protestants now shew in a different way, their aversion to accept the consequences of the principles of the Reformation, by lamenting overmuch our divisions, and forgetting the blessings that so far outweigh them all, even were they greater than they are. As well might we fall out with our summers for their growth of weeds. These divisions are more than signs of our intellectual pride, and religious conceit, and contentious spirit. They are also signs of the reality of our freedom, of the intellectual activity it has awakened, and of our profound interest in religious truth. Our divisions, with all their excesses and follies, are every way a more noble thing than that fraudulent thing Rome calls unity, or that lenity of apathy which characterized the Protestantism of last century. It may seem as if three centuries had been time enough for the Reformation to have exhausted its divisions, and to have healed them. But what are three hundred years to Him to whom a thousand years are but as one day. In the thousand years in which Rome, in her boasted unity, ruled the European world, we have seen how much slower was European progress. "Providence," Guizot finely observes, "does not trouble itself to follow out to-day the consequences of the principles which it laid down yesterday, yet its logic is not the less certain, and true, and sound." Let us beware of losing faith in the great result, because it comes not in our day. It will come, and will not tarry, therefore wait for it. Society will not always, under its right of private judgment, be like the drunken horseman to which Luther compared it—falling now on one side, now on the other. Its falls and oscillations will become fewer and more limited in their range as time advances, and as society enlarges that circle of intelligent minds that constitutes her common sense and self-regulating power. Society, like other children, will learn to balance itself, and by much the

same kind of training as the infant man, when, on the acquisition of the new faculty, all the previous stumbles and accidents are soon forgotten. Have we not seen some approach to this in the diminished range of the oscillations, both civil and religious, of British society in our own day, and shall we despair of seeing nearer approximations in future generations to the condition of a more united people in religion and in politics—when our progress shall not be by antagonism only—but by "the provoking of one another in love."

ART. V.—*The Human Body and its connexion with Man, illustrated by the Principal Organs.* By JAMES JOHN GARTH WILKINSON. London, 1851.

It is impossible to overestimate the effects of the diffusion of the facts and laws of modern science among a people. A nation cognisant, in ever so general and even vague a manner, of the magnitudes, distances, and revolutions of Astronomy, stands in a point of view, in relation to almost all the other subjects of human interest, wholly different from what can have been occupied by the old races of Egypt or India, of Greece or Rome, and even by the Old Testament Hebrews, or the Christians of ante-Copernican centuries. The influence of physiological and chemical public instruction has also quite altered the general view of man and man's position, and that all the more because these sciences come so near (or seem to come so near) the very marrow of questions the most ancient and also the most important to the race. These, and all similar influences, can in themselves be only good; else God would never have summoned us to the task of investigation, nor rewarded our labours with success. But in man's glorious yet awful freedom, no good thing comes to him without its possible evil, and no new light arises on him but it casts a shadow on his path. His hour of prosperity is ever his hour of danger, and there is no day so clear around him but he needs to take heed lest, when he thinks he stands on sunny heights, he fall deeper in darkness than he was before. Astronomy is uplifting; but has it not often cast its authors and their brethren into saddening doubts concerning the spiritual dignity of man, the mere parasite (as it would seem at first sight after the dazzling spectacle of the heavens) of an insignificant planetary globule among countless myriads

of suns, with their myriad myriads of secondary orbs? Chemistry and physiology are subtle, and they teem with truths as homely and useful as they are startling and wonderful; but have they not, on the whole, materialized our conceptions of the destiny of Him who is at once their inventor and their noblest object of study, even where they have not congealed us into machinery and stricken the Sun of Righteousness out of our sky? And, alas, have Paley and his followers, including even Chalmers himself, done much to arrest this downward spirit after all? Or if they have held it somewhat in check, have they really succeeded in quickening our material triumphs with the interior life of humanity, so as to ease us of the burden of the trophies we have won by enabling us to carry them onward with manly step, erected head and sportive grace, as becomes the heirs of immortality? Doubtless many devout and right Christian men have made discoveries in nature, and many have written glowing books for the national instruction in the ways of nature; but, so far as our reading has yet extended, their Science and their Religion are separable things; put together, not fused into one; a body and a soul, not body-and-soul united. In short, we are forced to say that, though science has often been christened, and that with much pomp and unction, it has not yet been christianized, (most certainly it has not been christianized for the general mind of Great Britain)—which is just to say that it has not been humanized. Yet, strange to say, it is precisely the human interest attaching to stars and atoms that renders Astronomy and Chemistry attractive to the general mind. Technicalities are only for the technical, and even in them the human interest is the main thing, when the last analysis is made. But with the rest of us, the human interest is the all-in-all, and therefore we are ready to be taught.

Mr. Wilkinson is deeply impressed with the feeling of this great want. The very title of his book proclaims it. The human body and its connexion with man! The great professor of Anatomy must at once conclude the man insane; yet he is not mad, most noble Festus. He only believes and assuredly knows that the human body is not man at all, that man (not *has* but) *is* a living soul, and that he (not *is* but) *has* an anatomical body. These things he believes, not only in church of a Sunday, or in the society of simple people of an evening, or with a patient and his weeping friends at a death-bed, but habitually, scientifically, and also practically in the chamber of sickness which is not unto death. The knowing belief of

it never leaves him, if we may judge from the unvarying tenor of this singular work, which we cannot pass without introducing it to the notice of our readers.

It is necessary to premise that, although the work purports to be a popular treatise, and is strictly such in its manner of procedure, it is scarcely popular in the customary sense of that adjective. Old yet new in its essence or pervading spirit, new and often startling in many of its developments, and big with a thousand suggestions, it is very difficult reading to the unaccustomed mind. It is thoughtful, far-reaching, profound, and occasionally difficult. It has no affinity to the books of the society for the diffusion of useful knowledge. Those who have confined their physiological reading to such works as Dr. Combe's, for example, can form no conception of the nature of it until they have read it, and even then they must read it again, and perhaps again. In counterbalance of this difficulty (a difficulty altogether proceeding from the depth and width of the author's views) it is nobly written; and, even if only for its poetic enthusiasm and beauty of style, it is a memorable piece of work. In these circumstances of its character, and also because it is an unmistakably original production, it stands not a little in need of something like an introduction to the vast majority of the Christian public,—which we accord it very heartily to our particular circle. It is necessary, however, to accompany such an introduction with some words of explanation and comment, which will, perhaps, facilitate the studies of those who may be induced to procure the book itself, while they may convey some dim notion of its bearings to those who cannot.

"Throughout the following pages," says Mr. Wilkinson, in a preface, which is as frank as it is quaint, "we have taken for granted the divinity of Christ, and the truth of Christianity, and with this tacit assumption, we have endeavoured to correct the whole of our general views." Maintaining that the atheist and even the universal sceptic do an essentially similar thing, he openly subsumes Christ as a hypothesis capable of solving the intertwined facts of life, never finds the hypothesis fail to answer to the facts, and therefore concludes that no man has a right to gainsay his hypothetical starting-point. "By pursuing this method, we have convinced ourselves that our Lord is written down in the pages of nature herself, as the truth of her whole creation." In addition to this profession of an unrefining faith in Christ, we learn that he cannot altogether take up with either of "those two

little parties, who think that they are the only two, the contenders for the principle of authority on the one side, and for that of reasoning on the other." Like the greater proportion of British Christians, he takes "some silver and gold from both;" and like himself, we presume, he resolves to "choose the party of science, as that to which the Lord of science is about to commit the kingdoms of the earth,"—a style of expression which betrays what the body of the book makes clear enough, namely, that he is an enthusiastic student of Swedenborg. In fact, this remarkable writer has translated several of Swedenborg's scientific works into admirable English, a service for which all studious men must thank him, even while repudiating the illuminated Swede as the hierophant of a sect. Be the specific details of his church-creed what they may, however, his doctrine of natural theology is nobly put:—

"If Christ," he exclaims, "be the God of the Christian, then natural Christology is the only theology of this kind which is possible in a Christian state." . . . "We feel it necessary to insist upon this, because even those who accept Christ's Godhead strangely pass Him by, when they are attempting to trace up all nature to their God. The consequence is, that it is only the truths of mere development and creation that occur in the sciences, and not those of love and redemption; whence moral and spiritual life is banished from the book of nature."

He has, therefore, no sympathy with a *posteriori* arguments for the existence of a divine artificer:—

"The proof that nature is full of Deity, lies in its power, when rightly seen, to soften the heart and moisten the eyes of the unbelieving world, and, without a controversy, to send the scoffer to his knees."

Such are the prefatory central beliefs of this out-spoken man of science. There is no mistaking his meaning, at least; which is as rare as it is satisfactory, among the secular authors of this century. It only remains to be said, that in philosophy he abhors materialism, detecting and exposing it even when it does not wear that name; that he rejects idealism as a system of pretentious inanities; and that he covets the honours and satisfactions of that inexorable realism, which he believes to proceed from God in Christ. The reader will now understand something of the sort of man and the thinker who offers him this discourse on the body of man; and he cannot but feel that, without pronouncing upon his preliminary creed, such an author must write a strange new book on such a subject, if (unlike all preceding Christian

anatomists) he remain true to his central ideas.

Although mainly and essentially an affirmative treatise, this work delivers certain stout protests against the tendency of more than one prevalent mode of studying physiology. For instance, the ultra-physical views of the organic chemists, as they call themselves, are condemned with infinite zest; as also the microscopical ways of the structural physiologists. It is curious that the chemists will heartily agree with our author in his denunciation of the cell-germinal doctrines, while the structurists will join issue with him against the analysts; but the best of both parties are pretty sure to feel a strong distaste for the contemptuous raillery with which he treats those whom he impugns. The results of the Liebig's are represented as certainly true,—“if not for the physiologist, at least for the candlemakers.” And as for the microscopical revelations of structure, “the Manchester manufacturers would do well to dress out the ladies of this generation in the spoils of the colours and forms of these brilliant creatures,” for “there should be something new as well as charming in a mantilla on the back of a professor's wife glorious with mimic cell-germs.” There is, undoubtedly, some ground for such assaults, but the manner of them betrays an undervaluation of the real discoveries of the investigators assailed. Let us pause a little over the relations of chemistry to physiological science.

It is some sixty years since the Lavoisierian definition of a chemical element gained a fair and sure footing in the world of scientific thought. An element is just a body which analysis has at any given time failed to decompose into simpler substances. No known force has yet extracted anything from gold but gold, or sulphur but sulphur, and sulphur and gold are therefore to be considered (always provisionally) as elementary or simple forms of matter. Potash was an element in the hands of Lavoisier, because he could not prove it to be compound, although he surmised as much; but it became a compound as soon as Davy resolved it, by a cunning device, into oxygen and potassium, the former being an element known to Lavoisier, the latter a new element thus discovered by the British Chemist. Sulphur will cease to be an element, if any one ever prove strong enough to break it up into two or more factors; for no substance yet within the reach of man is positively known to be really elementary, although some speculators have not been slow to argue that there must be at least two true elements in nature, else there could be no compound bodies

there either. It is therefore the main business of the chemist proper to endeavour the decomposition of every body he can lay his hands upon. Proceeding in obedience to this acknowledged instinct of the science, nothing has been sacred from his eager grasp. Everything is put to the torture, with a view to its secret composition in particular, and in the general hope of eventually discovering out of how few simple principles the world, with all its overwhelming variety of material forms, is built up. But there are (as yet) more than half a hundred substances impregnable to analysis, and they are therefore chronicled as elements in the meantime. In fact, every few years there is discovered a new one, so that there may well be a hundred simple bodies before the end of the century. As it is there are five elementary gases, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, fluorine—and chlorine; two simple liquids, bromine and quicksilver; and some fifty unde composed solids, carbon, boron, silicon, sulphur, phosphorus, selenium, tellurium, and the metals. All these so-called first principles of matter are extracted from the unorganized or mineral world around us, and it is curious to observe that the tendency of present progress is not to make the list of elements smaller and smaller, but quite the reverse. In short, the obvious probability is, that if the chemist could go deeper into the surface of the earth in quest of new rocks and mineral veins, or transgress the limits of the air, and pass to Jupiter or Mars, this sort of elements (namely bodies which his present instrumentation cannot decompose) would become innumerable by either tens or hundreds.

There is another and a higher task, however, close at hand. Dead plants and animals must be analyzed in their turn. All sorts of exorganic products and exuviae, the excrements and the corpses of organized nature, are therefore macerated, decocted, distilled, and submitted to the last analysis. But they yield no new element, being just made of the common dust of the ground! Some fourteen or fifteen of the old mineral elements are all they contain; four of them in a more notable proportion (by a great way) than the other ten or eleven—hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and carbon, three gases and one solid. So large and prominent a place in the chemistry of dead bodies is occupied by these three soft airs and that one hardest of matters, (airs and the diamond!) that Stöckhardt, a recent systematic writer, classifies them under the title of organogens. There seems to be an impression that they are the essential elements of matter that has been organized; and that the

other ingredients, such as sulphur, phosphorus, chlorine and iron, are only of secondary importance. It is very striking to find that water and common air contain the four chief constituents of plants, animals and the body of man, common air containing carbonic acid (or carbon dissolved in oxygen) as well as ammonia, which is composed of nitrogen and hydrogen. Out of water and common air the vegetable world builds its thousand living forms. These forms, once dead, contain cheese, fibrin and albumen of the very same composition as the albumen, fibrin and cheese of dead animals, to say nothing of starch, and sugar, and oil, and a hundred other less important principles. Vegetable and animal fibrin are mainly composed of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen and nitrogen. Sugar and starch are composed of carbon, oxygen and hydrogen; in other words, of pure coal and water. The compounds, the transitions, the analogies, the transformations of what has been called organic chemistry, are as wonderful and instructive as they are multitudinous.

What has been called organic chemistry, —for after all it is nothing but a name, and a wrong one. There is no such science; it is only the chemistry of exorganic forms, of substances that have been living, but are now dead, of the mere refuse and remains of organisation. The composition of those favoured substances from which the vegetable world weaves its tissues is known—water, carbonic acid, ammonia—the last of these being a product of the spontaneous decomposition of dead plants and animals, and all of them (taken together) containing hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and carbon, the four organogens of the elemental list. The composition of the proximate principles (such as vegetable fibrin, cheese and albumen, sugar and oil,) which are extractable by easy processes from dead plants, on the other hand, is also known. But the composition of the truly living tissues of vegetable forms neither is nor can be known. They die the moment chemistry puts her finger on them. She can trace the organogens into the living plant and out of it, but not in it. What may be the mode of arrangement of these organogens, or of their possible ingredients in matter which is genuinely alive, chemistry can never know. The living frame even of a mushroom is enchanted and sacred ground, where the poor chemist can only take the shoes off his feet, and confess the sanctity of life.

All this is to be said with still more emphasis of animal figures, for it is not always easy to discriminate between what is exuvial and what is really alive in a plant. But

the ox and the wether crop the grass of the field, thereby sustaining an incalculably more vivid life than what they destroy, and when they die their bodies yield fibrin, cheese and albumen of precisely similar composition to those of the plants they have killed and fed upon. Man himself supplies the wants of his body from either the roots, fruits and seeds of the earth, or from the dead remains of the animal kingdom; unless, indeed, when he draws his sustenance from an ingenious and culinary mixture of both vegetable and animal remains, as is the case among the minority in these temperate latitudes. In this capital instance also the chemist can follow the organogens into the thrilling organism—the food with its understood composition into the mouth and digestive viscera, the air into the lungs, and water to every pore; but he cannot pass a step beyond the threshold. He can but await the hour of death, and then submit what was the body of a brother to his fiery taxis. He may take a dead muscle and get fibrin out of it, a dead brain and find albumen, and then resolve his albumen and fibrin into their common elements, but he shall never analyze either a muscle or a brain.

There is even a gulf between those compounds, into which the constituents of a living creature fall on dissolution, and all the ordinary compounds of chemistry: the very ruins of life are as inimitable, as they are sacred in their origin. After all, it is in vain that the chemist assures the world how sugar is nothing but a compound of carbon and water, so long as he cannot make a particle of sugar out of water and carbon. And, if this is to be said of sugar, which is almost half-way down from the mount of life to the general plain of mineral existence, it must be affirmed with loud protest concerning what are called the plastic ingredients of the dead, fibrin and the rest. In brief, we do not, certainly, know the composition even of exorganic products:—we only know that, when submitted to particular processes of analysis, they yield the organogens in such and such proportions. It is a beautiful science, this of exorganic chemistry, (for we cannot consent to call it organic,) but it is only analytical; it is not synthetical at all. It can only take its things down, it cannot put them up again. The inorganic chemist resolves water into oxygen and hydrogen, but he also unites hydrogen and oxygen again, thereby reproducing water: whereas, the exorganic chemist cannot make a particle of oil, or alcohol, or cheese, or flesh, although he is able to destroy them and read off the carbon, oxygen, hydrogen and nitrogen they yield, and must therefore have con-

tained in some sense or other. Even exorganic chemistry is only a half-opened book, while organic chemistry, proper, is a volume never to be opened at all. There it gleams ever before us, beautiful, assuredly full of more than oriental marvels, but clasped with living adamant, guarded by a flaming sword, not to be approached. It is surely nothing less than a ceaseless memorial, that there are things which the very nature of them inexorably hides from the unready eye of man, so long as he is in the flesh; for none but a disembodied soul can ever pursue the study of the chemistry of life. Yet, everything that exists is for study, and this surpassing sphere must have its surpassing students in reserve; whence some fond Liebig or Mûlder might well argue the confident hope of a future state, as different from the future state belonging to their present doctrine, as heaven from earth.

In the meantime, it is to be most thankfully acknowledged, that the results of the so-called organic chemistry of the day are full of importance and beauty; and that neither for "the candle-maker" nor the speculator, but for the practical student of the sciences of nature. It is an immense affair to know precisely what mineral compounds and elements the vegetable world takes to itself, spins into such a strange variety of unanalyzable shapes, and quickens with life. It is no less interesting to observe the proximate principles composing the excrements and exuviae of these curious creatures, and then to discover the proportions in which the organogens can be extracted from those inimitable proximates. In one word, the tracing of the common chemical elements into the living plant, followed by the exact recovery of them after death, and that in combinations as unique as they are multifarious and mutually related, is knowledge of the most engaging and valuable nature. It is still more desirable, of course, to be apprized of the precise analytical (if not synthetical) composition of the food thus prepared for the animal kingdom, its exact relations to that of animal remains, if not of animals themselves; the nature of the processes of expiration and inspiration in so far as these are chemical, the manner of action of the properly chemical poisons, and so forth through a thousand details. In brief, there is no domain of physical science more positive and instructive, or even more wonderful than the exorganic chemistry of the present school, notwithstanding the inevitable but too often forgotten fact, that it is only the chemistry of the lifeless and the dead;—the lifeless food of plants, the organogens with the secondary ingredients of these living fabrics, and the

dead proximate principles (fibrin and the rest) of both plants and animals. It has already vastly extended the boundaries of chemistry, if not of physiology; and it is likely to lead, in the long run, to ideas which may be invaluable (were they only negative) in the future study of physiology itself. It appears to us, in fact, that the only thing wanted to steady the perilous tread of the would-be organic chemistry is the ever-present recognition of the fact, that there is no evidence yet forthcoming of the existence of carbon and its companions (as such) in even dead flesh and blood, much less in "the blood which is the life," and the muscle which leaps under the prick of pain or moves obedient to the will. And if it be in the very highest degree probable, though neither proved nor easily conceived to be capable of being proved, that living creatures use carbon and the rest (just as they are) for its purposes, it is certainly neither susceptible of proof, nor probable, that they are arranged into particles of fibrin and so forth in the live body. No sooner does that cease to be alive than it falls down into masses of fibrin, jelly, and their likes; exposed to moisture and air, these in their turn speedily fall down into still less organoid compounds; and at last the whole affair falls down into water, carbonic acid, ammonia, and other common bodies, lapsing back into the bosom of ordinary nature, where compounds can be not only decomposed, but compounded again by the hand of skill. That is all that can be said, and then the circle is complete.

The structural physiologists agree with all this, for they have never given in to the views of the ultra-chemical school. Even the thoughtful exorganic chemist will allow the halfness of the conquests he has yet made; that he can take down everything and put up nothing; and that the living particle is for ever beyond his grasp. Mr. Wilkinson, too, is likely quite prepared to grant all the importance we claim for the analytical labours of the chemist, although his strong feeling of their irrelevancy to his own inquiries has tempted him to speak with light scorn of the dealers in carbon and chemical formulæ. The truth seems just to be, that each school overvalues its own point of view, and underrates the positions of the others. It is the old story: men are fragments; may man yet prove a whole! In the meantime the wise student will travel from school to school, like the old scholars, and await the development of a many-sided doctrine. In the prosecution of such a course of study, being in all likelihood more or less familiar with the ways of both the chemical and the structural physiologists, he

cannot well do better than bestow a serious perusal on the volume now under notice. It will probably increase his temptation to do so, to be told that it may (with all respect for the striking originality of its author) be regarded as the Swedenborgian text-book on the subject, brought up to the present state of positive science, and set forth in the happiest style of illustration. It is now well understood that the Swedish seer looked at nature, say rather the universe, from a point of view never occupied by any other philosopher or school of science; and that alone is a circumstance to make his manner of thought dear to every open inquirer, especially since it is notorious that he was unquestionably one of the most learned and accomplished men of his own or any other time. In addition to this great recommendation—(the absolute newness of the point of view, in so far as the most of us are concerned)—the fact that Swedenborg and his disciples profess to look at all things from Christ, as the centre and soul of creation, must enhance the interest of a work written from that point of view for the Christian student of nature and of books.

After what has been said above concerning the true bearings of chemistry upon the science of the human body, the less initiated reader is prepared in some degree for the peculiar, altogether unassailable, and even mysterious character implicitly and habitually, we had almost said latently, assigned by our author even to the material stuff which gives its substance to the human body. But it has already been hinted that he has little more respect for the microscopists than for the chemists; the final cause of the microscope is the production of patterns for the weaver; and the microscopical observers deserve importance only as a sub-committee of Drapers' Hall! Alive to the stinging fact, that chemistry, like the antique Medusa, turns everything it touches to stone, he cannot, for the life of him, perceive what the peering of educated eyes through magnifying glasses at fibres, cells, cell-germs, and blood-globules can do for the knowledge of man's body as man's! All this is extreme and ungenial and illiberal, according to our thinking; yet it is very true that these structurists are, just like the chemists, prone to an overweening estimate of the vital bearings of their quaint and engrossing inquiries upon a large and manly doctrine of the physiology of man's body. But if those prying students have neglected the weightier matters of this law, neither should any critic overlook the anise and the cummin. Mr. Wilkinson knows this in his heart, for the gist of his complaint against the observers in

question (when stripped of its contemptuous banter) is just that they claim too much for their province, and that they are too soon ready with their quarried and well-cut stones for the future edifice. Yet surely the work must go on as it best can. The more that is prepared for the final building of the temple the better. Let every man work as hard as he can at his own task, for it will be but a small matter in the long run, that any one shall have thought he was cutting a capital, when he was only hewing a common and undistinguished stone for the foundation. By all means let the individual labourer strive to take a just and moderate view of his own importance and the real worth of what he is doing: and by all means too, let people try to put and keep their neighbours right on such points, for nothing but harm can come out of a false view of one's-self in the meantime; but let it be done courteously, respectfully, diffidently, in one word—christianly. Indeed a chemist or a structurist, coming on this militant or oracular book, will be little loth to declare it as Pagan in its practice of the social virtues, as it is Christian in its theory of the human frame and the destination of man: and yet the irritated critic would be wrong, for the inmost spirit of this book is still more truly christianized than its intellectual form.

Almost entirely rejecting the aid of the chemist, neglecting the painful acquisitions of the structurists, but holding fast by the positive anatomists from the beginning till now, our English Swedenborg descends on the physiology of the human body from the heights of thought, illustrating it by the principal organs. To convey an adequate idea of the procedure of these illustrations would be far from easy, and to review them critically is impossible within our limits. The only good account of the book is itself; and nothing but a counter-treatise could meet all the points we should have to question, to modify, to demur to, and to protest against. In this exigency it will be best to confine ourselves to a little gossip about one of the organs adduced; and it shall be the first—the human brain.

This chapter starts with the assumption, that the mind inhabits the head, or, according to anatomy, the brain; “the most general truth of consciousness, which lies in the head and speaks from the head.” Yet it is strange that Aristotle assigned so unimportant an office to the brain, regarding it as nothing but a mass of earth and water, without blood or feeling, good for little else (apparently) than filling up the comely skull-piece and keeping the heart cool! If the “solid voice of the head” be so

clear and unmistakable, it should not have been inaudible to the Stagyræite any more than to another surely. For our own parts we are conscious of the mind in the head, and readily refer it to the brain once made known by anatomy; but it is very questionable whether this consciousness of ours be a manifestation of the primitive consciousness of the race. To be conscious or sensible of a stomach is either to be guilty of afterthought, or to be the subject of disease; and the consciousness of thought in the brain or even in the head is referable to the same alternative. Everybody is given to understand from his earliest years that he thinks in or by his head, and everybody also is more or less morbid, so that a crucial experiment can scarcely be made. But it is to be presumed that an absolutely healthy and unindoctrinated man would be so harmoniously full of life that he should never dream of referring his thinkings to any part of his body whatever. Such analyses and local references are the product of afterthought and inquiry; and it is just as likely, to say the least of it, that our model man, beginning to think about the matter, should side with Aristotle as with us.

But our present author proceeds at once to a description of the brain and nervous-system,—the cerebrum, the cerebellum, the annular protuberance, the oblong medulla, the spinal cord, the forty-two pairs of nerves proceeding from or to the base of the brain and the sides of the cord, and the separable ganglionic or sympathetic system of nerves for the viscera,—“as it were a creeping or parasitical system, which weaves its meshes among the branches of the other.” The description is admirable. Indeed, all Mr. Wilkinson's descriptions are first-rate; they could not be bettered. Knowing without being pedantic, quite sufficient for his purpose yet also quite popular, eloquent but precise, they convey a sense of the living realities as it had never been conveyed before. They thrill with the life of their objects; and the student, who has spent a year or two in the dissecting room, surrounded by all the common helps of the technical study of what is called human anatomy, could not do better than come here and breathe his knowledge a little in company with the quick poetic spirit of the writer of these glowing chapters on the brain, the lungs, the heart, the chylopoietic viscera, and the skin. His information will, of course, remain as exact as ever, while we venture to predict that his insight will be more alive and real than it was. On the other hand, these clear, picturesque, vivid,

and right eloquent narratives are invaluable for the purposes of the general reader.

But so rich a thinker, and ready a writer, could not possibly content himself, on any occasion, with mere descriptive work; and the functions of the successive parts or storeys of the whole nervous system are assigned with great clearness of definition and brightness of language. In pursuance of this part of the subject, there is introduced a striking speculation on the relation of the brain to the mind, followed by a judicious criticism of phrenology. There is next devoted a large portion of the chapter to the question of the existence of a nervous-fluid or nerve-spirit, the affirmative of the question being argued for at considerable length. The nerve-spirit, once established to the author's satisfaction, becomes thenceforth the true brain of the soul, being at the same time the soul of the vulgar brain, which is a sort of soul to the rest of the body. The probable proper motion of the brain is then discussed, not without ingenuity. The function of the cerebellum is speculated upon quite as cunningly, the necessity of there being two halves to the brain is illustrated, the relation of the brain to the body is discoursed about, and then the chapter expands into a gorgeous corolla of talk about the higher analogies of the brain. Is all this wondrous prattle sound science? Alas! it is impossible to enter into the question, it is so large. Suffice it, that it appears to us that this beautiful and thoughtful writer over-estimates the value of analogy in positive science, and gives hypothesis a place which all the Masters disown for it, from Copernicus down to Dalton. Even if his doctrines be true, he has not made them out; and another scientific poet may weave as pretty a web to-morrow. All these high speculations seem to us the mere foregoing dream of discovery, worthy of a mighty discoverer's iridescent youth, but not worth more than their beauty until they be realized by actual research. At the same time their beauty is budding with suggestions on every side. It is impossible to consider them without wonder at the wealth of knowledge they display, at the sagacity which shines through them, at their excessive ingenuity, at the nobleness of their bearing, but also at the strange looseness of their methodology. It would be unjust to illustrate this by extracts, for the parts of this whole cannot bear isolation, else passages might be offered by the score, which are "either madder than all Bedlam, or inspired beyond the guess of folly." All we wish to do, is to carry into the mind of the reader some sort of clear-obscure notion of the kind of book, to the study of which

we summon him with hearty goodwill and even enthusiasm, although we can neither indorse many of the dogmas it inculcates, nor approve of its plans of investigation and its sneers at slower methods. It will complete this attempt of ours at the clear-obscure, to give it to be understood, further, that the book is sprinkled all over with observations and thoughts which are as true and important, as they are original; that teetotalism and vegetarianism are discussed with so much quiet wisdom, as to make one feel that one might safely follow the author anywhere; that the sanitary question is treated with a breadth and penetration as instructive as they are rare; and that the whole subject of healing is expounded here in its manifold principles by the most catholic doctor of the day. Mr. Wilkinson is a homœopathist, a hydropathist, a kinesipathist, an anthropopathist, a phrenopathist, a pistopathist, and also a plain believer in the christopathy of the early Christian church! To sum up all, there is hardly a subject within the reach of human interest which is not touched; if not directly, then indirectly, if not in exposition, then in figure, and by allusion, if not explicitly. It is at once the most multitudinous and the most orderly of modern treatises, professing to be works of science; and it must be repeated that it is written in a style so luminous and rich, as to accredit its penman the poet of the human body, if he is not yet the philosopher predestined to unlock its more interior secrets. Even if any or all of his new propositions should eventually turn out to be true, Mr. Wilkinson will be remembered by posterity as a seer, not as a man of science; for the philosopher not only finds the truth, but knows how he found it, while he is always able to teach the ingenuous student how to find it for himself. A thoughtful observer, widely informed, highly inventive, having a keen eye for analogies, those clews of science, most orderly, enamoured of simplicity, as candid as day, patient and sagacious, possessed of a solid understanding, and also owning a fund of common sense, our author might well become the high-priest of the doctrines of life and humanity, if he would but take the vow of self-denial on his teeming head, and dedicate himself to some thirty or fifty years of such painful conference with the reality of things as has been endured before him by Copernicus, by Cuvier, by Dalton, by Humboldt, and by all the master-spirits of this ongoing age of positive and indefeasible science.

ART. VI.—*König Alfred, und seine Stelle in der Geschichte England.* Von Dr. REINHOLD PAULI. Berlin, 1851.

2. *The Life and Times of Alfred the Great.* By the Rev. J. A. GILES, D.C.L. London, 1848.

WE are again indebted to that peculiar quality in our German neighbours, which they themselves quaintly denominate "Sitzfleisch," for a contribution to the history of our country, which, following as it does on the back of so many foreign labours, may well excite our fears lest the reproach of "incuriosi nostrorum" should in the end attach to us. The best biography of the most remarkable of all our kings, of him to whom, more than any one else, we owe the present form of English life, and whose memory was fondly cherished for ages, by the endearing epithet of "England's Darling," lies before us—compiled by German hands.

It may be that the Germans are not altogether disinterested in the researches which they have bestowed on the earlier portions of our history. A desire to promote the glory of their own country, rather than of ours, may have induced them to undertake the task of demonstrating how rich were the beginnings of a life which emanated from themselves. The same motive which prompted Thierry to write the history of Norman William, and Guizot to declaim at Falaise in his honour, may not impossibly have had its share in inducing Dr. Pauli to vindicate his true position for the King of the West Saxons. Still the task has been skilfully and manfully performed, the favour has been ungrudgingly conferred, and if the motive were a much less worthy one than that which we have indicated, there is a proverb which forbids us to receive a gift in a questioning spirit. But in addition to the benefit which the labours of Anglo-Saxon scholars have conferred upon us, by increasing the amount of our historical knowledge, we are farther indebted to them for the means of striking the balance between the claims which the two great elements of our existing race severally have on the national gratitude. More probably from ignorance of our early history, than from any other cause, it had for ages been the fashion to attribute all that was great and generous in England to Norman influences. Our kings and our nobles boasted of Norman descent, to the chivalrous spirit of the Normans our warlike supremacy was attributed, and even the existence of our much coveted constitution was scarcely traced farther back than to the reign of a

Norman king. Now, though it must still be admitted that it is to the new impulse which the Conquest gave to a people who never were aggressive abroad, and who for some generations had ceased to be even active at home, that we must ascribe not only the dominant position which England has so long held among the surrounding nations, but also that marvellous internal industry which she has exhibited, it has come to be recognised that the roots of our liberty, of our laws, of our language, and above all of that deeper individual life to which we owe our poetry and our philosophy, are all to be traced to Saxon times. Every objection to the study of the political, social, or spiritual condition of our Anglo-Saxon ancestors, on the ground of its want of interest or importance for a cultivated age, has thus been happily exploded, and though—in so far as the domestic broils of their numerous petty states, or even perhaps their Danish wars, are concerned—some might still join with Milton, in asking "what more worth is it to recount them, than to chronicle the wars of kites and crows flocking and fighting in the air," the observation is one which most of us would be disposed to extend to the minuter chronicling of all "flockings and fightings" whatsoever. A detailed account of the fightings of modern soldiers in the field, or of modern "citizens" round a barricade, would be little more edifying than if they belonged to the times of Egbeht or Alfred.

There is an "obiter dictum" in one of Schelling's Academic Lectures, which occurs to us as not unimportant in considering the extent to which we ought to regard our Saxon ancestors as barbarians. "Amongst the mass of false and idealess attempts of our day, stands prominently forward that so-called history of humanity, which takes its conception of the original condition of our species from traits of barbarious nations, compiled from books of travels. There is no such thing as a barbarous state which is not the result of a lost and degraded culture. It is a task which lies before those who shall in future endeavour to write the history of the world, to shew how even those who at present are in the condition of savages were torn loose from the rest of the world by revolutions, and are in fact the shattered remains of nations who, from being robbed of the already existing means of civilisation, have sunk down into their present condition. I regard the original condition of mankind as one of culture." It was not very fair in the German professor thus to charge the frivolity of his own time with an error, which, if error it be, has at

all events abundance of antiquity to recommend it. Without going back to the origin of the theory in Epicurus and his followers, the lines in which Horace has summed it up might at any rate have suggested themselves,—

‘Quum prorepserunt primis animalia terris,
Mutum et turpe pecus, glandem atque
cubilia propter,
Unguibus et pugnīs, dein fustibus, atque ita
porro
Pugnabant armis,” &c.

SAT. i. 3, 99, *et seq.*

The view of Schelling, viz., that all culture is the result of a revelation in which all the races of men originally participated, ought, at no time, one would think, to have been a novelty in a Christian land; and if he had chosen to enter into it at greater length, he could have had little difficulty in supporting it by considerations derived from profane as well as sacred history. But if it was not in place to discuss it farther in an Academic Lecture, much less would it be so in the pages of a Review, and we shall therefore content ourselves by deducing from it a distinction which it obviously suggests, and which we believe to be a sound one, that, viz., between a *rude* and a *savage* people.

That the Saxons were a rude people, in the sense of being but scantily supplied with the results of mechanical invention, is certain; and it is probable that the code by which their social intercourse was regulated was vastly more simple than that which Lord Chesterfield imposed on their descendants. They had few of the appliances, either physical or moral, which grow up in a densely peopled country, as the fruits of peace, and leisure, and time. But the question comes to be,—are these in truth the tests and only tests of civilisation? must all culture clothe itself in the garments of external refinement and physical convenience? or does not the real test, on the contrary, consist in the presence of those qualities, in virtue of which man differs from the animal and approaches to the image after which he was framed? In their outward circumstances the Germans of Tacitus did not greatly surpass the Canadian Indians of the present day, and they certainly fell short of the condition in which the Chinese have existed for centuries, and yet their life, in all the diviner qualities which belong to the life of man, differed far more from the thoughtless animal existence of the one, or the objectless and aimless artificial vegetation of the other, than from that of the most cultivated nations which the world has

known. In place of being the slaves of those immediate impulses by which the conduct of savages is regulated, we can see that in their present life there was a constant reference at once to the future and the past. In the whole of their institutions, rude though they were, we discover not only those elements of progress, those upward tendencies, which are equally significant as an index of the present, and a guarantee for the future, but we farther recognise the presence of a developed moral life, of which in many respects we ourselves might be envious. The last stage of progress which Horace enumerates,

“Ne quis fur esset, neu latro, neu quis
adulter,”

they had already reached, and such being the case, even if they had omitted some of its earlier steps, and had continued to fight for acorns with their fists, we should scarcely have been entitled to denominate them barbarians. History is but too conversant with forms of refinement in which the former stages have failed to act as a portal to the latter, and in which, though man's animal qualities have been curbed and weakened, the diviner element within him has by no means been strengthened in proportion.

It is no easy matter to form an estimate of the effects which the other great elements of our existing race may have had on our present condition. Whatever the original character of the companions of Rollo may have been, it is certain that their case was no exception to that historical law by which the nationality of the conqueror gives way before that of the vanquished, where the advantage in respect of civilisation is on the side of the latter.* They soon adopted the manners and the speech of the people among whom they settled, and it cannot be doubted that it is to the influences which they brought along with them from France that we owe those elements of dissimilarity which, since the Conquest, have existed be-

* *E.g.*, The Franks in Romanized Gaul, the Goths or Visigoths in Spain, the Lombards in Italy. The reverse was the case with the Greek and Roman colonies. In all the Italian and Sicilian colonies the language continued Greek; and France and Spain, at the present day, are instances of the extent to which the Romans influenced the speech of their provinces. Where no women are brought, as in the case of the Normans, the tendency to adopt the language of the country is much greater. To the sons of the conquerors it is the *mother-tongue*. In ancient times, the public life of the men in the *αγορά*, and of the youth in the *παιδεία*, along with the degraded position which the women held, prevented them from exerting their natural influence in this respect.

tween ourselves and the Germanic nations, of which till then we formed an integral part. Our insular position in itself would scarcely have given rise to a nationality very different from that of other seafaring Teutonic nations: those, for example, which surround the Baltic at the present day. Instead of that restless impulse towards external exertion, which we have in common with the French, we should alongside of a not very energetic application to mercantile pursuits, have retained that truest mark of a pure Teutonic people—a tendency to relapse into subjectivity, so soon as external motives to exertion are withdrawn. Instead of seeking new lands to conquer and colonize, we should have dwelt contentedly among our own people, meditating on the phenomena of individual consciousness, and revolving the problems of human destiny. It is remarkable that during the whole Saxon period there is not a single instance of an attempt at the acquisition of foreign influence; and when we find more than a century and a half before the times of Alfred the whole of the unobtrusive existence of a man so important as Bede, spent in the most varied mental avocations within the walls of his cloister of Jarrow, and behold him at last, as the only tokens of his good-will, distributing among his admiring and sorrowing disciples “the little articles of value which he had in his chest, such as *pepper, napkins, and incense*,” we seem to recognise in him rather the predecessor of the simple-minded Scholars and Theologians of Germany, than of the rich, busy, and business-like English Bishops of our own day.

But it is with King Alfred more directly that we have here to do, and in him we shall find, if we mistake not, precisely the ruler whom we should look for in a people amongst whom Bede had been a “servant of Christ and priest.” It may be thought that in taking the character of a man of remarkable endowments as the type of a people, we run a risk of adopting the exception as the rule, and no doubt exceptional characters, liable to the objection, exist in all times and places. Still, where we can find a man who differs from his contemporaries, not in kind but in degree, who carries out into actuality what they but imperfectly and fitfully indicate, the shortest method of arriving at an acquaintance with their qualities and tendencies is by regarding them in the steadier light which his greater energy and consistency sheds upon them. We must be sure that our man is a man of his country and of his time, and then the more completely his genius is the

culminating point of the life of his day, the more secure will be the glance with which we are enabled to look around us from the vantage ground which it affords. Now Alfred, as it seems to us, was a Saxon indeed, and when we come to consider him in the two leading relations in which he stood to his people, we shall find that the directions which his energy took were those neither of a Norman nor of an Englishman, but of a leader of that purer Teutonic race which then inhabited our land.

The method which we purpose to follow in our endeavour to gather for our readers something of what Bacon would call the “vintage” of Dr. Pauli’s labours, is to view the great Saxon in the two main features in which he there presents himself, first as the spiritual,* and then as the material leader of his people.

The youth of Alfred was remarkably favourable to the growth of a character naturally deep and thoughtful. Though his education, in the stricter sense, was neglected in a manner which to himself was the cause of many regrets, there were many circumstances which combined to supply its place. The care of his mother Osburh had familiarized his youth with the poetical treasures of his country. We are happy to find that Dr. Pauli’s criticism has not deprived us of Asser’s well-known story of the book which she promised to the first of her children who should become acquainted with its contents, and which was speedily awarded to Alfred, the youngest and fairest of them all.

Though his first journey to Rome, when little more than four years of age, could scarcely have exercised a conscious influence on his character, it is not impossible that impressions received even at this early period may have given a tinge to his future habits of thought.

The cause of the journey seems to have been the desire on the part of his father to obtain, as early as possible, for him into whose hand he, from the first, was desirous

* It is necessary that we should explain that the sense in which we here use the word “spiritual” is different from that in which it is employed by theological writers. Though for many reasons we prefer it to such colder words as “intellectual” and “mental,” we are far from intending by its use to liken the position of Alfred to that which belonged to those human instruments by which the Jewish Theocracy was governed; and if we find that his influence operated in a very high degree on the moral and religious, as well as on what may be more strictly called the mental progress of his people, we shall probably be furnished with a sufficient apology for using the word in our language which most nearly conveys the idea of his position. The corresponding word in German is “geistig.”

that the sceptre should descend, the benefits which he imagined would flow from the benediction of the head of the Church. Whether Alfred, in after life, retained any distinct recollection of his early anointing,* we are not informed, but it is probable that he was very far from attaching to it the same importance which it had in the eyes of his pious and somewhat superstitious father. But it was not by one journey alone that Alfred's infant powers of reflection were stimulated; scarcely had he returned when he again set forth, in company with his father, on the self-same pilgrimage. On this occasion, some time seems to have been spent at the Court of France, where Æthelwulf was received by Charles the Bald with every mark of honour; and no less than a year was devoted to his religious exercises, in the Christian Mecca, by the feeble king. This was the period between Alfred's sixth and seventh year, and the events connected with it, following so immediately upon those of his former journey, could not have failed to be deep and lasting. Dr. Pauli attributes to this second journey the "presentiment (Ahnung) of what we call classic, which in after days shewed itself in the Saxon king, alongside of that love for his own people and their speech, which he had inherited from his mother."

Whether or not we attribute to Alfred's early residence in Rome his future translation of the last of the Romans, there cannot be a doubt, that not only on him, but on our Saxon ancestors severally, the intercourse which they maintained with the then capital of the world must have exercised an influence of the most important kind. Their constant journeys thither, and the establishment which, from a very early period, they there maintained, are in themselves a tolerable guarantee for their having been more *au courant* of European affairs than we are usually in the habit of imagining. On this subject Dr. Pauli says,—

"Even since the arrival of Augustin, the islanders had preserved an uninterrupted communication with Rome. No long period elapsed till a house was there established for the reception of their pilgrims, and the instruction of their clergy. We have already seen two kings of the West Saxons die there. It was from the hands of the Chief-Shepherd of Rome that the English Archbishop received their pallium, many bishops their consecration. Offa's name was as familiar at St. Peter's as in the court of Charles."

Æthelwulf's enthusiasm for the Catholic Church induced him to signalize his arrival by presenting to the Pope and higher clergy of Rome gifts which, by their magnificence, conveyed no mean impression of the wealth of the land from which they came. But what is more important for us, he rebuilt the Saxon school, which, for the second time since its erection, had been burned down, and at the same time enriched it with the most liberal endowment. With the advantages which the Saxon school must have afforded, it may well be questioned whether the benefits which a Saxon youth must have derived from a visit to Rome, did not very greatly exceed those which it confers, for the most part, on a modern Englishman; and it has often appeared to us that, apart of course altogether from their ecclesiastical character, the existence of some such establishments in the great capitals of Europe, would have the effect of converting foreign travel from being little better than an idle amusement, into a serious and important part of the education of our youth.* It ought also to be remembered, that in earlier times, a journey such as that from England to Italy, was not only a more difficult, but a far more important affair than it is at present. The time which it occupied, and the contact with foreigners which, both on that account and from the absence of all organized means of transport, it must have occasioned, would render its effects very different from those which are produced on an Englishman who, by means of railways, and by the help of English speaking couriers and waiters, is transported from the west end of London, through a series of magnificent inns, to the Piazza d'Espagna. It is a fact which we are too apt to forget, that the more completely travelling is organized, the less important are its effects on the character of him who travels. The so-called "overland" journey to India, now-a-days, is not half so fruitful in human experience as a ride on horseback from Edinburgh to London must have been in the days of King James.

During the short and unhappy reign of Æthelbald, his eldest brother, we hear little of Alfred. It was during that of the second, Æthelbeht, that his youth was past, and it was then that, impelled by his inborn desire for instruction, he searched the kingdom of Wessex for a tutor in vain. It was about this time, however, that notwithstanding the difficulties which he encountered, he contrived to acquire the art of reading those Saxon

* As an instance of the carelessness with which the historians of the old school did their work, we may mention, that Hume supposes the anointing to have taken place on the *second* journey, and the *first* to have been in company with his father!

* We are aware that there is still an establishment for the instruction of English Catholic priests at Rome, but if it serves this purpose, it serves no other.

poems which hitherto he had carried about in his memory, and there is reason to suppose, that it was then also that he learned to write. To these acquirements he added those which were supposed to be more proper to his age and rank. In martial exercises, and more particularly, in the chase, he surpassed all contemporaries.

In the year 866, when Alfred was approaching his 17th birthday, King Athelbeht died, after a reign which Asser characterized as having passed "*pacifice et amabiliter et honorabiliter*." But the sceptre was not yet destined for the hands of Alfred. The third brother Athelric, who, according to the order of succession which his father had fixed, ought to have preceded Athelbeht, mounted the throne, and though, according to custom, the provinces of Kent and Sussex ought now to have been entrusted to the government of Alfred, as the next heir to the throne, they remained united to Wessex, Alfred readily and willingly assuming the position of "*Secundarius*" to his brother. It is now for the first time that we hear of those Danish invaders at whose hands Alfred was destined to suffer so much, and it is now also that, grown to man's estate, he appears in the field by the side of his brother, excelling in all those gifts of mind and body which had so endeared him to his parents, and which now rendered him the pride and the hope of the people. It is in connexion, moreover, with this period of his life that a circumstance is mentioned by Asser, which probably affected his personal character and mental complexion as deeply as any other which has been recorded; we refer to the mysterious disease from which he had suffered in his youth, which revisited him on the occasion of his marriage feast, and which continued through life to be a thorn in his flesh. Ingenuity has been expended in vain on the investigation of its nature, but the most probable conjecture appears to be, that it was some form of epilepsy. The whole account of its first appearance, and of its cause, of its miraculous cure, and of its return on the occasion we have mentioned, bears on its face the most unequivocal signs of romance. All that is certain is that, during the greater part of his life, Alfred had to perform the task which Providence had assigned to him under the pressure, or at all events, under the continual apprehension of a bodily infirmity, and that in so far as he himself was concerned, his constant prayer was, that whatever he might suffer from it otherwise, neither it nor any other malady, such as leprosy or blindness, should be permitted to interfere with the fulfilment of his kingly

mission. It is not improbable, that in the case of Alfred, as of so many others, he gained quite as much by the habit of mind which his malady compelled him to form, as he lost by its occasional interference with his efficiency. It is only when a conflict arises between mind and body, that it is possible for a majority of men to place the latter as it were over against the former, and to feel that their mental action is independent, not only of the external circumstances in which they are placed, but even of the trammels of their material existence. So long as the two continue in harmony, the former is but too apt to give way to the solicitations of the latter, and even where the life is irreproachable, there is danger of its qualities being the spontaneous result of easy temper, rather than the conscious effort of virtue. It is not improbable, that the same cause may have tended to strengthen those feelings of deep and simple piety for which Alfred during his whole life was so very remarkable, and which by removing from his mind all undue solicitude for the future, left him fresh and free for the discharge of his present duties.

Five years after his accession, on the 23d April 871, the third son of Æthelwulf died, and, notwithstanding he had left two sons, the succession opened to Alfred by the destination both of his father and brother, as well as by the then universal custom of preferring the uncle to the nephew, if the latter happened to be in infancy, or otherwise incapable of government. The circumstances of the case on the present occasion seemed to justify the rule, for King Æthelred's death followed immediately on the back of a serious reverse which he had suffered from the Danes, and Alfred mounted the throne at a period when no ordinary anxiety filled the minds of his subjects.

With Æthelred's death, terminated the period which Dr. Pauli has aptly characterized as the "years of preparation." The next section, which he calls the "period of trial," is chiefly occupied with the "fightings and flockings" of which Milton speaks. It contains the account of Alfred's successes, his reverses, his exile, his wanderings, and his ultimate glorious return, and though the changes of fortune which he then experienced were far from unimportant with reference even to that side of his character which we are here endeavouring to bring into view, the actions themselves will fall more properly under that portion of our sketch, in which we propose to glance at him for a moment, in the light of the material leader of his people. In the section in which his "working in State and Church" is treated

of, he comes more directly before us, as influencing their spiritual progress.

Dr. Pauli commences this section with a quotation from an early work of Gibbon—his “*Outlines of the History of the World.*” “*Amidst the deepest gloom of barbarism,*” says the great chronicler of Decline, “*the virtue of Antonius, the learning and valour of Cæsar, and the legislative genius of Lycurgus, shone forth united in that patriot king.*”

“*And it is true,*” continues Dr. Pauli, “*that we look around us in vain, in ancient, in mediæval, and in modern history, for one in whom these traits are exhibited in harmony so perfect. Our wonder indeed becomes overwhelming, when we see one man alone adorned with so many great qualities, whilst during almost his whole life he had to struggle with difficulties so formidable. In such circumstances a comparison with Frederick or Charlemagne will not carry us far in our endeavour to form for ourselves a conception of the Great King of the Small Wessex.*”

For a verification of what to some of our readers may perhaps appear an overcoloured picture, we must refer to the pages of Dr. Pauli's work; our limits preclude us from attempting to do more than to mention a few of the leading grounds upon which Alfred's claim to the lofty character which is here assigned to him are founded. Dr. Pauli repudiates, and apparently for good reasons, the charge of despotic propensities which has been brought against Alfred, though he agrees that he made his personal influence felt in a manner which had not been customary with his predecessors. The “*Earldormen,*” or chiefs of shires, who, in their respective provinces, had enjoyed a power little inferior to that of the King himself, now appear in the less dignified position of courtiers, and what is singular, and very significant of Alfred's clearness of view, notwithstanding his passion for learning, and the deep interest which he took in religious matters, the Bishops were by no means permitted to exercise the same amount of political influence which they had possessed in previous reigns. Alongside of that serious and child-like reverence, not only for the institutions of Christianity, but for those of the Mosaic ritual, which caused him to incorporate in his laws a greater number of texts from Holy Writ, than is to be found in any other code, even of the middle ages, we find in Alfred the most perfect freedom from all superstitious reverence for the Church or its ministers. He maintained the best relations with the priesthood, but he was far from permitting them any undue influence in the affairs even of the Church itself, and the idea

which was revived at the Reformation, of the rulers of the State being the temporal head of the Church likewise, was one to which the mind of Alfred was no stranger. Even on such occasions as his annual missions to Rome, Alfred seldom availed himself of the services of the clergy, and amongst all his messengers whose names are preserved, but one has been positively identified as a Priest. Yet the true interests of the Church were the objects of his most anxious solicitude. Since the scholars of Bede disappeared from the stage, a rapid decline in learning and efficiency, the result partly of troubles from without, and partly of inactivity within, had established itself among the clergy of England, and the ninth century did not boast of one single eminent divine. We cannot present a more lively picture of the state of matters as they then existed, and the manner in which Alfred regarded them, than by quoting his own words from the introduction to his translation of Gregory's *Regula Pastoris*. “*I have often reflected,*” he says, “*on the wise men, both clerical and lay, who once existed among the English people, and on those fortunate times when Kings ruled who obeyed God and his Evangelists, who preserved peace at home, upheld the purity of manners and their own power, and even stretched their influence beyond the limits of their dominions. How zealous were then the clergy both in learning and teaching, and in all the duties of their sacred office, when from foreign lands men came hither in search of learning, whilst now if we wish it at all, we must seek it amongst strangers. So entirely,*” before his time, “*had it forsaken the English people, that there were few on this side the Humber who understood the service of the Church in English, or could translate an epistle out of Latin, so few were they when I began to reign, that I cannot recall to my recollection a single one south of the Meuse.*”

In Alfred's time, England still enjoyed some of the advantages which its remote position had given it, in being freed from several of the more objectionable regulations which a desire to separate the clergy from the people had induced the Church to introduce into other countries. The service was still read in the vulgar tongue, and that “*worst best instrument of Papal dominion,*” the celibacy of the clergy, had not yet been introduced. In all, however, that pertained to Catholicism, as it had been preached here heretofore, Alfred was a good Catholic, and his lamentation over the decline of learning among his clergy did not confine itself to empty words. He sought

in foreign lands the assistance which his own country denied him, and Flanders and Germany sent him two learned monks whose activity he himself has celebrated. The latter, who was called Johannes from the similarity of name, has been improperly supposed to have been the celebrated father of the Realists, Johannes Erigena.* Nor was his zeal for the interests of the Catholic faith confined to his own dominions. On one occasion whilst the heathen Danes lay encamped before London, he vowed that if he should succeed in conquering them, and driving them from the land, in token of gratitude to God, he would send an embassy to the Christian Churches which the apostles, Thomas and Bartholomew, had planted in the far east, with messages of comfort and rich gifts. With the fulfillment of this vow commenced our connection with our Indian Empire. Asser tells us, moreover, that he had read letters and seen gifts, which were sent to his King by the Patriarch of Jerusalem, and Dr. Pauli very naturally conjectures that these may have been brought by the Indian Missionaries, who, most likely, would not fail to visit the Holy Land on their return. The story of Alfred's meeting with that "child of nature," the cow-herd, Dane-wulf, whilst wandering in the wilds of Somerset, and his future promotion to the Bishopric of Winchester, are too well known to require mention here. Of far greater importance is the connexion which Alfred formed with his future biographer, Asser, the Welsh monk of St. David's.—We shall follow Dr. Pauli's example in quoting the very interesting passage in which Asser himself recounts their meeting.

"About this time," he writes of the year 884, "I came also, by the King's invitation, from the farthest parts of Western Britain into Saxony, and when I had travelled through many provinces I arrived in the land of the South Saxons, which in Saxon is called Sussex, under the charge of guides of that people. There, in his Royal Vill, called Dine, I saw him for the first time. After he had received me with kindness, in the course of conversation he entreated me to devote myself to his service, to establish myself with him, and to leave whatever I possessed on the other side of the Severn for love of him; he promised to reward me bountifully, and he has kept his word. I replied that I could not consent without some time for reflection; for it did not seem to me right that I should leave those sacred places in which I had been born, nurtured, and consecrated, for the sake of earth-

ly honour or power, unless I was forced to do so. Upon which he said, 'If you cannot consent to this, bestow upon me, at least, the half of your services; spend six months with me, and the other six in Wales.'"

Asser still hesitates, but promises to return with an answer from his monastery in six months, and thereupon, on the fourth day he and his set forth on their homeward ride. Scarcely had he quitted the king when he was seized with a violent fever, in the city of Winchester, where he lay for a whole year, day and night, struggling between life and death. When the promised six months had elapsed, Alfred sends messengers to inquire into the causes which had delayed the return of the learned monk. Asser assures him that so soon as his illness leaves him his promise shall be fulfilled, and finds, as we may imagine, no great difficulty in persuading the heads of his monastery of St. David's to consent to an arrangement likely to prove so advantageous to them all, though the condition of spending six months of each year in Wales (either six on end, or three alternately) was still adhered to. When Asser returned, the King, who according to Saxon custom continually changed his residence from place to place, was at Leonaford, where he tells us he "was very honourably received," and remained eight months, during which he read to him from all sorts of books, such as he suggested or had by him, for it was his constant custom, day and night, amidst all distractions of mind and body, either to read himself or hear others read to him.

Though at the risk of fatiguing those of our readers who are already familiar with the subject, we cannot deny to those who are not, the pleasure which we know they will derive from the life-like picture which Asser gives of the studies in which these eight months were spent by the knowledgeable and simple-hearted son of Cedric,—

"As we sat one day in the royal chamber, and conversed after our accustomed manner, it happened that I mentioned to him a passage from a certain book. After he had listened to me with the closest attention, and followed my words with the most lively interest, he drew from his bosom a book which he constantly carried about with him, and in which the daily lessons, psalms, and prayers, which from his youth he had been accustomed to read, were written, and requested me that I might copy the quotation into it."

Asser, joyfully thanking heaven for the zeal which quickened the heart of the king, is speedily at his service. When he had set himself to write, however, he found that every corner of the book was already filled,

* See a note on this subject in Turner. He says that as Actæon was eaten by his own hounds, so the two Johns, being pedagogues, were murdered by their own boys, and argues from thence that such ferocity not being very frequent even in boys, they must have been the same John.

Alfred himself having written many things in it. Asser pauses, but when the king urges him, he says,—“Permit me to write this quotation on a leaf apart; who can tell whether we shall not find many other passages which may please you? If such should chance to be the case, then we shall feel glad that we have commenced a new collection.” “That is a good thought,” said the King; and Asser hastened to fold a sheet, in the beginning of which he wrote the passage in question. He had judged rightly; for that very day, at Alfred’s request, he copied no less than three other passages into the sheet, and no long time elapsed till it also was filled, so numerous were the thoughts which occurred in the conversation which Alfred desired to treasure.

His first acquaintance with Latin seems to have been made through Asser, and it is a question whether he was not also indebted to his teaching for the still more elementary art of writing. To us it seems strange to find

“the wisest mon
That was in Englelond on,”

commencing, in middle life, what we are accustomed to regard as the rudiments of education, and yet it cannot be doubted that, even under such disadvantages, his mental condition was far preferable to that of the great majority of persons in our day, who, long before the age which he had reached, have ceased to learn. It was a boast of Goethe, which his practice justified, that at whatever age he might die he would die a student: he might have added, that he would die young. He who can say, *γηράσκω δ’ αὖτ’ πολλὰ δεδάσκειν*, is furnished with the only antidote against the inroads of age. But it was not for himself alone that Alfred learned. In the scholar he never forgot the King, and his first thought was to impart to his people the comfort and the strength which he himself had derived from the sayings of the wise. To the great regret of his admirers no copy of the precious collection which he called his hand-book “quem Enchiridion suum, id est manuum librum nominari voluit, eo quod ad manum illum die noctuque solertissime habebat,” has reached our times, though it was commonly known so late as the twelfth century. Its loss is the more to be regretted from its having contained, besides quotations, notices of the earlier history of his country and his house, and thus, in a certain sense, being an original, and the only original work which he is known to have composed.

In Alfred’s day, and for several centuries after him, Boethius’s consolations of Phi-

losophy supplied, to the thinking world, the place of those purer and deeper sources from which it was drawn, and we may readily suppose that his zealous instructor did not fail to impart to him its treasures. The consequence was that Alfred, with Asser’s aid, immediately undertook the task of rendering it acceptable to his less learned subjects by means of a translation. It is not a little remarkable that on a book so little heeded in our day, the honour of translation which the hands of Alfred conferred, should have been repeated, after the lapse of some four centuries and a half, by those of Chaucer. It is not our purpose to follow Alfred through the similar works which he performed, the number of which, his descendant Ethelwerd tells us, was unknown in his day. In all, his system was the same, that, namely, of allowing himself not only a royal license as regards freedom of translation, but of introducing his own sentiments wherever he found it convenient. In that which, for historical purposes, is the most important of his works—his translation of Orosius, he has carried this practice farther than in the others. The geographical knowledge of his author with reference to the north being peculiarly imperfect, he quietly comes to his aid with such farther information as he himself possessed. He defines the Germany of his day, and specifies the races to which its inhabitants belonged, and though the information which he obtained from the great whale fisher Ohtheric, with reference to Scandinavia, did not serve to correct the then prevalent belief of its being an Island, they exhibited the zeal with which Alfred threw himself into inquiries which were little in accordance either with his own pursuits, or with those of the priests and bishops who were his fellow-labourers.

The same patriotic views which incited him to become the geographer and ethnographer of his day, naturally gave rise to the desire that his subjects should be furnished with a Saxon version of the Church History of their great countryman Bede, and whether the translation be the work of Alfred or not, there can be little doubt that, directly or indirectly, it was to him that they owed it.

But we are not here writing either a history of Alfred or a review of his works. Enough has been said to show that “amidst the deepest gloom of barbarism” his ambition took a direction far more elevated, and far more elevating, than that of any of his successors. In the long list of Plantagenet, Tudor, and Stuart kings, we have heroes and conquerors, men whose conceptions were grand, and whose energy was great; but we search in vain for one who was not

only the constitutional head of the clergy, but the actual leader of the "clerisy" of his time, and to whose eyes the kingly office seemed to impose the duty of being the interpreter of wisdom, not less than the representative of power.

It is a common error to suppose that the qualities of a great thinker and of a great actor can scarcely be united in the same person. The possibility of their union is not denied, but the idea is, that the habit of treating questions in the abstract has, in all cases, a tendency to diminish the power of dealing with them when they present themselves in a concrete form. The mistake, we believe, arises from the circumstance of our opinions being formed from observations which are of necessity restricted to persons of no extraordinary powers. In the majority of cases, if a man, either from chance or temperament, has betaken himself to abstract studies, he finds it necessary, in order to make any way in them, to withdraw himself from the distractions of detail, and the consequence is, that the habit of dealing with what is called "business," is lost. On the other hand, he who has no call to higher pursuits, lives in the bustle of the market or the forum, and by cultivating the habit which the other has neglected, becomes as expert and ready as his neighbour is clumsy and hesitating. But the inability of the one no more resides in the nature of his abstract studies, than the dexterity of the other is the necessary consequence of his banishing all loftier considerations from his mind. In the one case and in the other, the character is the result of limited powers, which necessitated the formation of exclusive habits. But where nature has been more bountiful, no such necessity is felt, and no such habits are formed. In such persons, an acquaintance with principle gives security and steadiness to practice, whilst practice furnishes a continual test of the accuracy of principle. The two parts of their nature, far from conflicting, aid and support each other, and the clearer and deeper the one becomes, the greater will be the efficiency of the other.

We know no case in which this double nature was more conspicuously and harmoniously exhibited than in Alfred, for whilst he asserted to himself, as we have seen, the position of "England's Head," in a sense altogether different from that in which it was claimed by any of our other kings, he is, at the same time, entitled to the very first rank as a guardian of the material interests of his people.

In history, from the external manner in which, till within the last half century, it was written, Alfred flourished chiefly as the

conqueror of the Danes, and his character in this respect is consequently so well known, as to render it altogether superfluous that we should dwell on it here. We shall, at once, take leave of it with the remark, that if success, as a general, be a guarantee for the possession of practical ability, to Alfred it must have belonged, in a degree which few have surpassed, and that if his conquests were less showy than those of Edward III. or Henry IV., the practical benefits which his country derived from them were infinitely greater.

But it was in his political institutions, more especially, that the practical genius of Alfred shone forth, and so great was the reputation which he enjoyed, in this respect, among his contemporaries, and so vast the fame of his deeds which descended to his posterity, that in the 12th century, when the hand of the Norman was heavy on the land, every institution which the Saxons regretted, and every liberty to which they clung, was invariably attributed to their now almost mythical king. Of the social arrangements thus indiscriminately imputed to him, one was the division of England into shires, whereas an exactly corresponding division into the *gá* or *sár*, existed from the very first settlement of the Germans, and was, indeed, common to all Germanic tribes.

It is to his enlightened insight into the principles of government, that we are indebted for the first separation of the judicial from the executive functions, and in the appointment of professional judges, we trace the working of one who was guided by an idea, in an age in which we should have expected chance or necessity to be the only teachers. Nor was this all. From the difficulty which he found in discovering persons qualified to fill the offices which he thus created, he thought it necessary himself to superintend their proceedings. He constituted himself into a sort of "Cour de Cassation," and with the industry of a Chancellor of future times, he addressed him to the task of reviewing the judgments which were brought before him.

"It was his special care," says Dr. Pauli, "to discover if any from ignorance or dishonesty, from love, fear, hate, or corruption, had been guilty of injustice. It happened sometimes that the Judges confessed their unskilfulness. Then Alfred read them a lecture after this fashion—'I wonder exceedingly at your presumption, now that you are clothed by God and me with the office and dignity of the wise, that you neglect to make yourselves acquainted with what wise men have done and thought. Either lay down instantly the insignia of power, or set yourselves to work diligently to acquire wisdom.' . . . Oftentimes Earls and high dignitaries went from his presence, and

endeavoured in their old age to acquire what they had neglected in their youth, nay even contended with boys in the schools, choosing rather to set themselves to the rudiments of learning, than to lay aside the offices which they held."

Dr. Pauli adds that if any portion of the history of Alfred is credible it is this, since it is repeated frequently, and rests beyond all question on the testimony of eye-witnesses. In addressing himself to the duties of a legislator, Alfred was not unmindful that the only system of laws which can be suited to the condition of a people, is one which has grown out of their natural genius and the conditions under which it acts, "*nec unius hominis est, nec temporis, constituere rempublicam.*" "I durst not venture," he says, "to set down much of my own, not knowing whether it would please those who should come after us." As the basis of his work, he adopted the existing codes or customs of his predecessors, the Kentish collection of the first Christian King Athelbert, with the addition of his successors Lothare, Eadric, and Wilfred, that of his own ancestor, Ine, of that which Offa the great had given to Mercie. Of these he adopted that of Ine almost entirely, adding to it from the others, and modifying it in accordance with his own Christian views. It is not a little remarkable that the now almost exclusive, and apparently indispensable punishment of deprivation of liberty should have dated no further back than Alfred. The first mention of imprisonment which we find among the Germanic nations is the imposition of it by him as a punishment for perjury! Another innovation still more significant of the altered position of affairs, and of his own idea of the royal prerogative, is the introduction of the punishment of death for treason.

Dr. Pauli's last section professes to treat of Alfred "in the family and as a man," but little beyond what is contained in, or may be conjectured from, the provisions of his most paternal testament, is brought to light. Having provided for all whom nature or accident had entitled to his bounty, he divided his remaining treasure between the two great objects which had shared the energies of his life—the advancement of the material and spiritual interests of his people; and it is not a little significant of his character, that in an age such as his he gave to the latter its full share. Nor did the Church gain over the dying Alfred the ascendancy which it then so often obtained; for in the quadruple division which he made of this latter portion of his effects, two parts only were devoted to the support of monasteries, and to purposes which might be called ecclesiastical, whilst the third was to be distributed in

alms, according to the celebrated rule of Gregory, "*Nec parvum cui multum, nec multum cui parvum; nec nihil cui aliquid, nec aliquid cui nihil;*" and the fourth was destined for the support of the school of Winchester, which he had founded for the education, more especially, of the children of his nobles.

That such arrangements were made by one possessing the deepest sense of personal religion, in an age when not only religion itself, but all spiritual life whatsoever, seemed to centre in the Church, is a sufficient witness to the truth of Dr. Pauli's remark, that Alfred felt and thought more as a German than a Roman Catholic, and that in his character were already to be traced the rudiments of those opinions which afterwards showed themselves in the independence of Protestantism.

Such, according to the latest and best considered judgment, was Alfred. In his own day, in addition to the well-founded gratitude which sprang from a sense of benefits conferred, and the rational admiration which the display of the highest human qualities, in the widest sphere of action, elicited, his person was surrounded by the halo which, even after the introduction of Christianity, their mythical descent from Wodan conferred on the posterity of Cedric. In after times, when his people groaned under the Norman yoke, their regrets for him and for his race magnified to almost heroic proportions the virtues of the Great West Saxon. In the twelfth and thirteenth centuries Alfred had become a semi-mythical character, and the same feelings of reverence which deduced his origin from the gods, thus, as it were, restored him to them again.

Our opinion of the manner in which Dr. Pauli has discharged the duties of a biographer has already been indicated during the progress of our sketch. The industry with which he has investigated and compared, and the acuteness with which he has criticised the sources of Alfred's story, has enabled him not only to reject much of what the undiscerning zeal of his predecessors had adopted, but what is still more valuable, to bring back within the pale of authentic history much which formerly we had only hoped might be true. It is refreshing to find how well the historical Alfred of Dr. Pauli fills up the proportions which our imaginations had traced out for the traditionary hero. But in addition to the "thoroughness" which we scarcely feared to miss in the disciple of Niebuhr and of Bunsen, we find a clearness of style and a sprightliness of narration, of the presence of which we do not always feel so confident, when we open the pages of one

of Dr. Pauli's countrymen. Whoever may translate the book into English will find no difficulty in adapting it to the reading powers even of those of our countrymen who are least conversant with German ideas, and we are very gravely mistaken if it does not speedily become an integral portion of our national literature. The subject is naturally treated with far greater fulness than in any of the works (those of Turner, Lappenberg, or Kemble) in which it occurs incidentally, and the superiority of Dr. Pauli's book to all of those in our own tongue of which the life of Alfred has been made the special subject, is more manifest than those who are sensitive for the honour of our national literature could have wished. We have turned over the tedious and puerile pages of the latest of them all, "The Life of Alfred the Great, by the Rev. J. A. Giles," and it is not without some degree of national abasement that we concur in the opinion of it which Dr. Pauli has expressed in the section in which he treats of the literature of his subject.

"The newest work," he says, "merits to be mentioned only as the last, so faulty is it in every respect, so destitute of all investigation of the sources, and of all elegance in the representation. It does the English little honour, that so glorious a subject as the life of Alfred, the darling of old England, on the thousandth jubilee of his birth, should not have found a more worthy treatment."

Since the above was written, we have learned with pleasure that the translation of Dr. Pauli's work is in able hands, and that, too, under the auspices of a very liberal publisher. We consider the enterprise to be one, the success of which is by no means a matter of indifference to our countrymen. Without in any degree giving way to the extravagancies of "hero-worship," it is scarcely possible to over-estimate the benefits which a nation derives, from keeping steadily before its eye the images of its worthies. For the effect of lofty characters on the popular mind, secured by the apotheosis of heathen and the canonization of Catholic times, we must now trust to the labours of the historian; combined in the present case with those of the translator. In the character of Alfred it is fortunate that the closer view which we thus obtain, more than compensates for the halo of mysterious grandeur which it removes. Many of his qualities are such as may not only be contemplated, but imitated with advantage by all whose position has conferred upon them the power of influencing the fate of others; and who, even of the humblest of us, can say that his own position has not done so more or less?

Even a constitutional monarch might now find it difficult to assume the functions of the legislator to the extent to which Alfred did, and the opportunity of displaying the talents of a general do not occur to many; but it was in neither of these directions that his energies were habitually exercised, or that his daily influence was felt. It was as an example of earnest, patient, and pious striving after a diviner life, than that into which, when effort is laid aside, the human animal of all times inevitably relapses, that he went as a pillar of fire before his own generation, and that he goes before ours. True it is, that his light was set on a high place, but we may remember for our comfort, that the rays which emanate from qualities such as he exhibited, have in themselves an upward tendency. Eminent virtue is far too valuable, and far too rare, to permit any one who possesses a trace of optimism to fear that, however little it may be rewarded with worldly prosperity, it will ever be concealed by obscurity of station.

-
- ART. VII.—1. *On some remarkable and hitherto unobserved Phenomena of Binocular Vision.* By CHARLES WHEATSTONE, Esq., F.R.S. *Philosophical Transactions*, 1838.
2. *On the law of Visible Position in Single and Binocular Vision, and on the Representation of Solid Figures by the vision of dissimilar Plane Pictures on the Retina.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S., Edinburgh. *Edinburgh Transactions*, vol. xv., Part ii., 1843. Reprinted in *Philosophical Magazine*, May and June 1844, vol. xxiv.
3. *On the Knowledge of Distance given by Binocular Vision.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, *Edinburgh Transactions*, vol. xv., Part iv., 1844. Reprinted in *Philosophical Magazine*, May 1847, vol. xxx., pp. 305.
4. *On the Conversion of Relief in Inverted Vision.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S., Edinburgh. Reprinted in *Philosophical Magazine*, June 1847, vol. xxx., pp. 432.
5. *Description of Several New and Simple Stereoscopes for Exhibiting as Solids, one or more Representations of them on a Plane.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S., Edinburgh. *Transactions of Royal Scottish Society of Arts*, 1849. Reprinted in *Philosophical Magazine*, January 1852.
6. *Account of a Binocular Camera, and of a*

- Method of obtaining Drawings of Full Length and Colossal Statues, and of Living Bodies, which can be Exhibited as Solids by the Stereoscope.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, K.H., D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S., Edinburgh. *Transactions of Royal Scottish Society of Arts*, 1849. Reprinted in *Philosophical Magazine*, January 1852.
7. *Notice of a Chromatic Stereoscope.* By the Same, &c., &c.
8. *Le Stéréoscope*, Bulletin du Monde Scientifique. Par M. L'ABBE MOIGNO, Aumônier du Lycée Louis le Grand. Feuilleton de *La Presse*, du 28 Décembre 1850.
9. *Binocular Perspective.* By JAMES HALL, Esq. *Art-Journal*, March 1852, pp. 89, 90.

THE History of Science presents us with numerous cases where an important idea, or an ingenious invention, have long failed to attract the attention which they merited, and where the development of the one, and the improvement of the other, were requisite to bring them into public notice or practical use. An original idea may derive all its importance from the discovery of its useful application, and a rude instrument may be forgotten by all but its author, till a more fortunate inventor reproduces it under a new form, and with more valuable and extensive properties.

Even for centuries the Microscope of Roger Bacon, and of Drebbel, served but to astonish the young and amuse the curious; and without greatly detracting from the merits of Leuwenhoek, and other naturalists who used it, we may safely assert, that till it became achromatic by the labours of Lister, Ross, and others, it was not fitted for those noble researches in natural history and physiology, in which it has performed so important a part. The refracting Telescope, too, whose inventor we cannot confidently name, was a small and useless toy, till Galileo turned it to the heavens; and though in the hands of Huygens and Hevelius, it added new satellites to our system, and displayed new forms and structures in the primary planets, yet it was only, when made achromatic, through the labours of Hall, Dolland, Fraunhofer, and others, that it became an essential instrument for the advancement of astronomy. The Reflecting Telescope presents to us the same peculiarity. We do not know its inventor. Even in Sir Isaac Newton's hands, and as constructed and applied by himself, it effected no discoveries in the heavens. Sir William Herschel gave it magnifying and penetrating power, and opened its eye upon those glorious worlds, which in the dark bosom of

space might have been for ever concealed. Even then, however, the sidereal universe presented new subjects of research. Matter, as if reduced to its elements, whitened in nebulous forms the more distant regions of space, and the genius of Lord Rosse was evoked to construct gigantic instruments, to resolve into suns and systems the pale atoms of light which clustered on the receding frontier of creation.

Like these valuable inventions, the Stereoscope has had its infancy and its manhood. At first a simple experiment exhibited by a rude and imperfect apparatus, it was soon forgotten; and it was not till the discovery of its true theory and its valuable applications, and till the invention of new combinations by which these applications were to be effected, that it was brought into public notice, and made one of the most popular and interesting instruments which science has presented to the arts. We propose, therefore, to devote this article to an account of the history, construction, and application of the Stereoscope, and of those principles and phenomena of binocular vision, or vision with two eyes, on which it depends, and with which it is connected.

The term Stereoscope, from *στερεος* a solid, and *σκοπειν* to see, is the name of an apparatus employed by Mr. Wheatstone, "for representing solid figures," by combining in one image two plane representations of the object as seen by each eye separately, a combination which can be easily effected by the two eyes alone, without the aid of any apparatus, merely by directing them to a point nearer than the two plane representations of the solid. The fundamental facts in binocular vision, on which this remarkable illusion depends, may be thus expressed:—

When we view, with both eyes, or with each eye successively, any solid object, that is, any object in relief, or in the converse of relief, any cameo or intaglio, for example, each eye sees the object differently, or, what is the same thing, dissimilar pictures of the object are painted on the two retinae.

This important fact has been long ago published by optical writers, and is well known to optical observers, though Mr. Wheatstone has claimed it "as a new fact in the theory of vision." The first writer who has distinctly referred to it, is the celebrated Leonardo da Vinci, in his "Treatise on Painting." The following account of his observations is given by Dr. Robert Smith:—*

* *Compleat System of Opticks*, vol. ii. Remarks, p. 41, § 244. As Dr. Smith does not give this passage under inverted commas, it might have been presumed that it was an abstract of Leonardo da Vinci's Obser-

"Leonardo da Vinci," says Dr. Smith, "has made a curious observation, not improper to be mentioned in this place:* That a painting, though conducted with the greatest art, and finished to the last perfection, both with regard to its contours, its lights, its shadows, and its colours, can never shew a relievo equal to that of the natural objects, unless these be viewed at a distance, and with a single eye. Which he thus demonstrates:—If an object, C, be viewed by a single eye at A, all objects in the space behind it, included, as it were, in a shadow, E C F, cast by a candle at A, are invisible to the eye at A; but when the other eye at B is opened, part of these objects become visible to it; those only being hid from both eyes that are included, as it were, in the double shadow C D, cast by two lights at A and B, and terminated in D; the angular space E D G, beyond D, being always visible to both eyes. And the hidden space, C D, is so much the shorter, as the object, C, is smaller and nearer to the eyes. Thus, he observes, that the object, C, seen with both eyes, becomes, as it were, transparent, according to the usual definition of a transparent thing; namely, that which hides nothing beyond it. But this cannot happen, when an object, whose breadth is bigger than that of the pupil, is viewed by a single eye. The truth of this observation is, therefore, evident; because a painted figure intercepts all the space behind its apparent place; so as to preclude the eyes from the sight of every part of the imaginary ground behind it."

Upon this interesting paragraph Mr. Wheatstone makes the following observations:—

"Had Leonardo da Vinci taken, instead of a sphere, a less simple figure for the purpose of his illustration, a cube, for instance, he would not only have observed, that the object obscured from each eye a different part of the more distant field of view, *but the fact would also, perhaps, have forced itself upon his attention, that the object presented a different appearance to each eye. He failed to do this, and no subsequent writer, within my knowledge, has supplied the omission; the projection of two obviously dissimilar pictures on the two retinae, when a single object is viewed while the optic axes converge, must, therefore, be regarded as a new fact in the theory of vision.*"—Pp. 372, 373.

Now, it is quite true, that Leonardo da Vinci does not state that the two spheres do not present a different appearance to each eye; but his figure demonstrates ocularly,

variations. Mr. Wheatstone gives the passage in inverted commas, and calls Dr. Smith's paragraph a quotation from Leonardo's *Trattato della Pittura*, and he refers to a separate work, viz., "A Treatise of Painting," p. 178, London, 1721, as if it were a different work from Leonardo's. We mention this, as we were misled by the mistake to search for it as a separate treatise. Since this note was written, we have looked into the *Trattato*, &c., Roma, 1817, p. 245-6, and find that the passage referred to is not a quotation.

* *Treatise of Painting*, p. 178. London, 1721.

that each eye sees different pictures, because each eye sees parts of the sphere which are not seen by the other, two pictures so dissimilar, that if combined, they would represent the sphere in relief. In commenting upon the passage, Dr. Smith observes, that we distinguish the place of a near object "more accurately with both eyes than with one, in as much as we see it more detached from other objects beyond it, and *more of its own surface, especially if it be roundish.*" Here Dr. Smith does not speak merely of a sphere, but of any solid object whatever, and as he distinctly states that *the two eyes exhibit parts of the object which are not seen by one eye, the pictures on each eye must be dissimilar.* And in proof that Dr. Smith considers the demonstration of Leonardo da Vinci already quoted, as referring, not only "to the object obscured from each eye," but to the pictures of the sphere in each eye, he draws the conclusion, "that an object does not appear larger to both eyes than to one, *unless by reason of some particular circumstances, as in the observation of Leonardo da Vinci.*"*

Subsequent writers, too, were well acquainted with the existence of dissimilar pictures in binocular vision. Mr. Harris remarks in his *Treatise on Optics*,† that "by an inspection of the figures, it is manifest enough, that a larger segment of a round object can be seen with both eyes open, than with one eye alone;" and in Dr. Smith's curious experiment with a pair of compasses,‡ and in Dr. Wells' experiment with two rulers,§ referred to by Mr. Wheatstone, the pictures seen by each eye were totally dissimilar.

Dr. Smith, indeed, who first made the experiment with the ruler, gives a drawing of it by each eye, and not only shews in the drawing that the right eye sees the right side only; and the left eye the left side, but he distinctly states that the right side of the ruler is seen by the right eye, and the left side by the left eye. But to remove all doubt, if there could be any doubt, of the truth of our position, we have only to refer to Dr. Porterfield's *Treatise on the Eye*,|| where he actually gives drawings of an object as seen by each eye, the one exhibiting the object as viewed "endwise" by the right eye, (to use a word of Dr. Berkeley's,) and the other the same object as viewed laterally by the left eye. These views of the object as seen by the eye, not

* Opticks, vol. ii., Remarks, p. 109, § 708.

† Page 113, § 64.

‡ Optics, vol. vi. p. 388, § 977, 978.

§ Wells' Essay on Single Vision with Two Eyes, p. 44.

|| Vol. I., Book III., chap. III., axiom 2, pp. 412, 413, plate v., fig. 37. Edinburgh, 1759.

as drawn in Dr. Porterfield's diagram, are actually binocular pictures, suited to the stereoscope, if a line protended from the eye, which the instrument will display as stretching out into space.*

* Since the above paragraph was written we have found a complete confirmation of the opinion which it contains in Aguilonii *Opticorum Sex Libri*. Antwerpia, 1613. folio. In the fourth book of this elaborate work Aguilonius treats at great length of the Fallacies of Vision, *De Fallaciis Aspectus*, and discusses the subject of *Binocular Vision* with great distinctness. After shewing, what Euclid did before him, how to find the part of a sphere, whether convex or concave, that is seen by one eye, he gives a separate diagram, (lib. iv. prop. lxxxv. p. 307,) in which he proves that each eye, in binocular vision, sees different pictures of it, the portion of the sphere that is seen by the left eye being invisible to the right eye, and *vice versa*, there being one portion of it between these two that is seen by both eyes. He then lays down a rule for ascertaining in all solids whatever, which part of the body is seen by one eye, and which part by the other. This rule may be thus expressed: If a line or ray, as he calls it, drawn to the one eye reaches it, that part will be seen; but if it does not reach it, that is, if it is stopped by any prominence on the body, it will not be seen. To the mass of rays that reaches each eye, and gives the vision of it to that eye, he gives the name of the optical pyramid, which is different for each eye. The following is the passage in which he shews that in all bodies whatever the same rule holds, and that the pictures of such bodies in each eye are dissimilar. *Non sphaera modo, sed etiam cylindro et cono, ac ceteris corporibus universis convenit, eam quae spectatur portionem radiis tangentibus comprehendi. Cum enim tangentes lineae extremæ sint illarum omnium quæ ab uno eodemque signo (in quo oculus positus esse intelligatur) ad propositum corpus duci possunt; perspicue sequitur, eam corporis partem quæ videtur, tangentibus undique radiis contineri. In hac enim parte nullum punctum reperire est a quo recta linea ad oculum duci non possit, per quam proinde aspectabilis forma recta efferatur.* Page 313. In an earlier part of his work, namely in book ii.,* where he is treating of the vision of solids of all forms, *de genere illorum quæ tria genera (ta sterea) Græce nuncupantur*, he has great difficulty in explaining, and fails in doing it, why the two dissimilar pictures, arising from the same parts of the solid being at different distances from each eye, do not, when united, give a confused and imperfect view of it. *Cum res una duobus spectatur oculis, anguli qui ad vertices sunt pyramidum opticarum, non semper equales inter se existunt; nam præter directum obtutum, quo pyramides equales esse oportet, in quamcumque partem limbi oculi convertantur, imparibus semper angulis formas rerum addmittunt, quorumvis major est quæ ad propinquiorem oculum terminatur; is vero minor, qui oculum spectat remotiorem. Quod sane manifestum per se esse arbitror; id vero admiratione dignum puto, quo pacto fiat ut quæ limis oculis cernuntur non omnia confusa ac velut informia videantur, etsi per axes opticos in res ipsas defixos intuitus fiant. Nam majoribus spectata angulis majora, minora minoribus apparent. Si ergo res una eademque altero quidem oculo major, altero vero minor propter angulorum in quos pyramides terminantur inequalitatem conspiciatur, illa profecto se ipsa major et minor, eodem tempore, et eodem intuitu vidbitur, atque ita cum singulorum oculorum phantasia minime sibi congruant, confusa quedam ac perturbata rei imago sensui principi exhibebitur.* Aguilonius does not venture to assert that though the solids are seen clearly and distinctly, (*clare et perspicue cernuntur*.) the major and the minor line exactly co-

In support of these observations, we may refer to the experience of every optical, or even of every ordinary observer. What artist does not shut one eye when he paints or models? Who has not observed the fact, that their left eye sees only the left side of their nose, and their right eye only the right side, two pictures altogether dissimilar? Who has not noticed, that when they look at any thin, flat body, edgewise, such as a thin book, they see both sides of it, *the left eye only the left side, and the right eye only the right side*, while the edge or back nearest the face is seen by both eyes? What student of perspective, male or female, who has drawn the picture of a chair or a table from *one point of sight*, or as seen by *one eye*, does not know for certain that the picture of the chair or table drawn from *another point of sight*, or as seen by the other eye, must be *dissimilar* to the first?

"We have other helps," says Mr. Harris, "for distinguishing the prominences of small parts, besides those by which we distinguish distances in general, in their degrees of light and shade, and the prospect we have round them. And by the parallax on account of the distance between our eyes, we can distinguish besides the front part of the two sides of a near object not thicker than the said distance, and this gives a visible relief to such objects, which helps greatly to raise or detach them from the plane on which they lie. Thus the nose on a face is the more remarkably raised by our seeing each side of it at once."—*Treatise on Optics*, p. 171, § 205.

That is, the relief is produced by the combination of the two dissimilar pictures given by the two eyes, which is clearly the principle of the stereoscope,—a principle which Mr. Wheatstone has the merit of having

incide, (*sibi mutuo et exacte congruunt*.) but he talks of a common sense exerting its power to correct the imperfect union, and prevent the dissimilarity of the two pictures from passing into the primary sense: *Non tamen eadem diversitas in primum sensum transit si modo per axes intuitus fit.*

But, to go still farther back in the history of optics, the celebrated Physician Galen, who lived seventeen hundred years ago, has given such a distinct account of the phenomena of binocular vision, in the 13th chapter* of the 10th book of his work, *De usu portionis corporis humani*, that it is certain that he was clearly acquainted with the dissimilarity of the pictures in each eye. We are almost ashamed to adduce any evidence to prove that every author who has written on the binocular vision of solids, and every optical observer who has looked at them, were well acquainted with the fact which Mr. Wheatstone claims "*as a new one in the theory of vision*" discovered by himself, namely, that there is a "*projection of two obviously dissimilar pictures on the two retinae when a single object is viewed while the optic axes converge*," and consequently that the vision of objects in relief is produced by the union of these two dissimilar pictures.

* Aguilonii *Opticorum Sex Libri*. Lib. II. prop. 38, A.B.

* Edit. Lugduni, 1550. Tom. II. pp. 591-594.

been the first to exhibit practically, by combining the pictures of objects as seen with each eye, by means of an apparatus, consisting of two plane mirrors placed at an angle of 90° , in which the eyes of the observer see, by reflection, the superimposed images of the two plane representations of the object.

Such is the principle upon which the operation of the stereoscope depends, and such its practical application. We come now to consider the theory of the process by which two plane figures *apparently* coalesce, and exhibit, in virtue of this apparent coalescence, the perfect representation of the object in relief from which the figures were taken. In attempting to give such a theory, Mr. Wheatstone proceeds to consider the "Binocular vision of objects of different magnitudes," to which he devotes a section of his Paper:—

"We will now inquire," he says, "what effect results from presenting similar images, differing only in magnitude, to analogous parts of the retina. For this purpose two squares or circles, *differing obviously*, but not extravagantly in size, may be drawn on two separate pieces of paper, and placed on the stereoscope, so that the reflected image of each shall be equally distant from the eye by which it is regarded. *It will then be seen, that notwithstanding this difference, they coalesce, and occasion a single resultant perception.*"—*Philosophical Transactions*, 1838, p. 355.

Mr. Wheatstone then proceeds to describe an experiment for ascertaining the difference between the lengths of two lines which the eye, by some magic power hitherto unknown, can *force into coalescence*, or, to use his own words, for ascertaining "the limit of the difference of size within which the single appearance subsists." He does this by employing two images of equal magnitude, and making one of them visually less than the other, "by causing it to recede from the eye, while the other remains at a constant distance." "By this experiment," he adds, "*the single appearance of two images of different size is demonstrated.*" Mr. Wheatstone then proceeds to give a sort of *rule* or law, for ascertaining the ratio between two lines which the eyes can force into coincidence or coalescence, so as to "occasion a single resultant perception:"—

"If the pictures be *too unequal in magnitude*, the binocular coincidences does not take place. It appears that if the inequality of the pictures be greater than the difference which exists between the projections of the same object, when seen in the most oblique position of the eyes, (*i.e.*, both turned to the extreme right or extreme left,) ordinarily employed, they do not

coalesce. Were it not for the *binocular coincidence* of two images of different magnitude, objects would appear single only, when the optic axes converge immediately forward, for it is only, when the converging visual lines form equal angles with the visual base, (the line joining the centres of the two eyes,) that the two pictures can be of equal magnitude, but when they form different angles, the distance from the object to each eye is different, and consequently the picture projected in each eye has a different magnitude."—*Philosophical Transactions*, 1838, pp. 385, 386.

Having laid down these principles, as proved by direct experiment, but which, as we shall afterwards demonstrate both from theory and experiment, are the results of incorrect observation, Mr. Wheatstone goes on "to examine *why* two dissimilar pictures projected on the two retinæ *give rise to the perception of an object in relief*:"—

"I will not attempt," he says, at present to give the complete solution of this question, which is far from being so easy, as at first glance it may appear to be, and is, *indeed*, one of *great complexity*. I shall, in this case, merely consider the most obvious explanations which might be offered, and shew their insufficiency to explain the whole of the phenomena.

"It *may be supposed*, that we see but one point of a field of view, distinctly, at the same instant, the one, namely, to which the optic axes are directed, while all other points are seen so indistinctly, that the mind does not recognise them to be either single or double, and that the figure is appreciated by successively directing the point of convergence of the optic axes successively to a sufficient number of its form.

"That there is a degree of indistinctness in those parts of the field of view to which the eyes are not immediately directed, and which increases with the distance from that point, cannot be doubted, and it is also true, that the objects thus obscurely seen, are *frequently doubled*. In ordinary vision, it may be said, this indistinctness and duplicity is not attended to, because the eyes shifting continually from point to point, every part of the object is successively rendered distinct, and the perception of the object is not the consequence of a single glance, during which a small part of it only is seen distinctly; but is formed from a comparison of all the pictures successively seen, while the eyes were changing from one point of the object to another.

"*All this is in some degree, true; but were it entirely so*, no appearance of relief should present itself, when the eyes remain intensely fixed on one point of a binocular image in the stereoscope. But on performing the experiment carefully it will be found, *provided the picture do not extend too far beyond the centres of distinct vision, that the image is still seen single*, and in relief, when in this condition. Were the theory of corresponding points true, the appearance should be that of the superposition of

the two drawings, to which, however, it has not the slightest similitude."—*Philosophical Transactions*, pp. 391, 392.

Mr. Wheatstone proceeds to give two experiments, which he says are *equally decisive against this theory*, the first of which only is subject to rigorous examination. He draws "two lines about two inches long, and inclined towards each other, on a sheet of paper, and having caused them to coincide by converging the optic axes to a point nearer than the paper, he looks intently on the upper end of the resultant line, without allowing the eyes to wander from it for a moment. *The entire line will appear single, and in its proper relief, &c.* The eyes sometimes become fatigued, which causes the line to become double at those parts to which the optic axes are not fixed, but in such case all appearance of relief vanishes. The same experiment may be tried with more complex figures, but the pictures should not extend too far beyond the centres of the retinae." Now these are not the correct results of the experiment, for no sooner does the eye see the real phenomenon—the duplicity of the image at all points but one—than Mr. Wheatstone ascribes it to ocular fatigue, and to too great an extension of the pictures. As the two lines are equal, in the present experiment, the difficulty of obtaining an apparent combination of the lines is greatly diminished; but Mr. Wheatstone has previously maintained, that when the two lines are unequal they are not only single, but *mathematically coalescent*.

In the different passages which we have now quoted from Mr. Wheatstone's paper, and in the remaining pages of it, he is obviously halting between truth and error, between theories which he partly believes, and ill observed facts which he cannot reconcile with them. Had he placed his reliance on the law of visible direction, which in a previous part of his paper he acknowledges to have been established in opposition to D'Alembert by Sir David Brewster, and "with which," he says, "the laws of visible direction for binocular vision ought to contain nothing inconsistent," he would have seen the impossibility of the two eyes uniting two lines of unequal length; and had he believed in the law of distinct vision, which has been established by the same author, he would have seen the impossibility of the two eyes obtaining single vision of any more than one point of an object at a time. These laws of vision are as rigorously true as any other physical laws—as completely demonstrated as the law of gravity in astronomy, or the law of sines

in optics, and the moment we allow them to be tampered with to obtain an explanation of physical puzzles, we convert science into legerdemain, and philosophers into conjurors.

Such was the state of our stereoscopic knowledge in 1838, after the publication of Mr. Wheatstone's interesting and important paper on the physiology of vision. In the same year, at the meeting of the British Association at Newcastle, and before the publication, or perhaps even the printing, of Mr. Wheatstone's Memoir, Sir David Brewster communicated to the mathematical and physical section a paper "on the law of visible direction," in which he established this great law of vision, which, though it had been maintained by preceding writers, had been more recently proved by the illustrious D'Alembert to be incompatible with observation, and the admitted anatomy of the human eye. At the same meeting Mr. Wheatstone exhibited his stereoscopic apparatus, which gave rise to an animated discussion between Dr. Whewell and Sir David Brewster, in which the learned Master of Trinity, adopting Mr. Wheatstone's views, already explained, maintained that the eye, or rather that the retina, in uniting or causing to coalesce into "a single resultant impression" two lines of different lengths, had the power either of contracting the longest, or lengthening the shortest; or, what we would have suggested, in order to have given the retina only half the trouble, that it contracted the long line as much as it expanded the short one, and thus caused them to combine with a less exertion of muscular power! Sir David Brewster, on the other hand, maintained that the retina had no such power, that so extreme an hypothesis was not required, and that the law of visible direction afforded the most perfect explanation of all the stereoscopic phenomena. Subsequent to this discussion, Mr. Wheatstone accepted of Sir David Brewster's demonstration of the law of visible direction as satisfactory, and thus refers to it in his paper on the Stereoscope, in the *Phil. Transactions*, to which we have so often referred:—

"The law of visible direction for monocular vision has been variously stated by different optical writers. Some have maintained, with Drs. Reid and Porterfield, that every external point is seen in the direction of a line passing from its picture on the retina through the centre of the eye; while others have supposed, with Dr. Smith, that the visible direction of an object coincides with the visual ray, or the principal ray of the pencil which flows from it to the eye. D'Alembert, furnished with imperfect data respecting the

refractive densities of the humours of the eye,* calculated that the apparent magnitudes of objects would differ widely on the two suppositions, and concluded that the visible point of an object was not seen in either of these directions, but sensibly in the direction of a line joining the point itself and its image on the retina; but he acknowledged that he could assign no reason for this law. Sir David Brewster, provided with more accurate data, has shewn that these three lines so nearly coincide with each other, that 'at an inclination of 30° , a line perpendicular to the point of impression on the retina, passes through the common centre, and does not deviate from the real line of visible direction more than half a degree, a quantity too small to interfere with the purposes of vision.' We may therefore assume, in all our future reasonings, the truth of the following definition given by this eminent philosopher,—'As the interior of the eyeball is as nearly as possible a perfect sphere, lines perpendicular to the surface of the retina must all pass through one single point, namely, the centre of its spherical surface. This one point may be called the centre of visible direction, because every point of a visible object will be seen in the direction of a line drawn from the centre to the visible point.'

"It is obvious that the result of any attempt to explain the simple appearance of objects to both eyes, or, in other words, *the law of visible direction for binocular vision, ought to contain nothing inconsistent with the law of visible direction for monocular vision.*"—*Phil. Trans.* 1838, pp. 387-8.

Notwithstanding this acceptance of the law of visible direction, and the correctness of the conclusion at which he has here arrived, every succeeding page of Mr. Wheatstone's paper, in which he explains the phenomena of the stereoscope, not only stands in direct opposition to this law, but as we shall shew in the sequel, in direct opposition to the most obvious and irrefragable experiments.

In consequence of the discussion at Newcastle, and the high authority upon which the law of visible direction was impugned, Sir David Brewster re-examined the subject, repeated his calculations, and especially set himself to determine by rigorous experiments, whether or not the human eye had the power of causing two lines of different lengths or of different apparent magnitudes to coalesce into one. He found that the eye had no such power, and that no such power was required to convert the two plane pictures for the stereoscope into the apparent solids from which they were taken, as seen by each eye. These views were made public in the lectures on the *Philosophy of the Senses*, which he occasionally delivered in the

College of St. Salvator and St. Leonard, St. Andrews, and the different stereoscopes which he invented were also exhibited and explained. Mr. Wheatstone's inventions were at the same time fully communicated to the class, and his stereoscopic apparatus was even lent to the students to take to their own lodgings, that they might fully appreciate the value of his labours.

In examining Dr. Berkeley's celebrated theory of vision, the undoubted foundation of our sceptical philosophy, to which two lectures were generally devoted, Sir David Brewster saw the vast importance of establishing, upon an impregnable basis, the law of visible direction, and of proving by the aid of binocular phenomena, and in opposition to the opinion of the most distinguished metaphysicians, that we actually see a third dimension in space. He, therefore, submitted to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, on the 23d January and the 6th February, 1843, a paper "*On the law of visible position in single and binocular vision, and on the representation of solid figures by the Union of dissimilar Plane Pictures on the Retina.*" Nearly ten years have elapsed since this paper was published, and no reply has, as far as we know, been made to it by Mr. Wheatstone or any of his friends.

In continuing his researches, Sir D. Brewster submitted to the Royal Society of Edinburgh, on the 15th of April 1844, a paper "*On the knowledge of distance given by binocular vision,*" and on the 6th of May of the same year, another "*On the conversion of relief by inverted vision,*" or, to use a word recently introduced by Mr. Wheatstone, on *Pseudoscopic vision* with one eye. During these inquiries, Sir David Brewster invented, and had constructed in St. Andrews and Dundee several new stereoscopes, but particularly the *Lenticular stereoscope*, now in universal use. They were made of all materials, of wood, of tin, of brass, and of bristol board, and of all sizes, from that now generally adopted to a microscopic variety which could be carried in the pocket. New drawings were executed for them, and binocular pictures taken by the sun, were lithographed for the instrument by Mr. Schenck of Edinburgh. Stereoscopes made by Mr. Loudon, optician, Dundee, with various binocular diagrams, lithographed at his expense, were sent to several of the nobility in London, and to other places in England, and an account of these stereoscopes, and their application to portraiture and sculpture, and of a binocular camera for taking portraits and copying statues, was submitted to the Royal Scottish

* And also, he might have added, respecting the relative positions of the different parts of the eye.

Society of Arts, in 1849, and published in their Transactions.*

After endeavouring, though in vain, to induce some London opticians and photographers to construct his stereoscope and execute binocular pictures for it, Sir David Brewster carried to Paris in the spring of 1850, a very fine instrument, executed by Mr. Loudon, optician in Dundee, and a binocular photographic portrait of Dr. Adamson of St. Andrews, by himself. He showed this instrument to M. l'Abbé Moigno, the distinguished author of *L'Optique Moderne*, and to M. Soleil, and his son-in-law, M. Duboseq Soleil, the eminent Parisian opticians, and to some members of the Institute of France. These gentlemen saw at once the value of the instrument, not merely as one of amusement, but as an important auxiliary in the arts of portraiture and sculpture. M. Duboseq Soleil immediately began to make the new stereoscope for sale, and executed a series of the most beautiful binocular daguerreotypes of living individuals, statues, bouquets of flowers, and objects of Natural History, which thousands of individuals flocked to examine with the new instrument. After giving a brief notice of the labours of Mr. Wheatstone, and of Sir David Brewster's lenticular stereoscope, and binocular camera, for taking the pictures with mathematical accuracy, the Abbé Moigno in the article placed in our list of papers on the Stereoscope, gives the following account of the introduction of the instrument into Paris:—

"In his last visit to Paris, Sir David Brewster intrusted the models of his Stereoscope to M. Jules Duboseq, son-in-law and successor of M. Soleil, and whose intelligence, activity, and affability will extend the reputation of the distinguished artists of the Rue de l'Odéon, 35. M. Jules Duboseq has set himself to work with indefatigable ardour; without requiring to have recourse to the Binocular Camera, he has with the ordinary Daguerreotype Apparatus procured a great number of dissimilar pictures of statues, bas-reliefs, and portraits of celebrated individuals, &c. &c. His Stereoscopes are constructed with more elegance and even with more perfection than the original English instruments, and while he is shewing their wonderful effects to natural philosophers and amateurs who have flocked to him in crowds, there is a spontaneous and unanimous cry of admiration."—*La Presse*, Dec. 28, 1850.

In the beautiful collection of philosophical instruments which M. Duboseq Soleil contributed to the Great Exhibition of 1851,

and for which he received a council medal, he placed one of Sir David Brewster's Lenticular Stereoscopes with a fine series of Binocular Daguerreotypes. The Stereoscope attracted the particular notice of the Queen, and M. Soleil executed a beautiful instrument which was presented to Her Majesty in his name by Sir David Brewster. In consequence of this public exhibition of it, M. Soleil received several orders from England, and a large number of the Lenticular Stereoscopes were thus introduced into this country. The demand, however, became so great that English workmen, and particularly Mr. Pearce, 36, Bedford Bury, Covent Garden, devoted themselves to their manufacture, and sold in a few months many hundreds if not thousands of the instrument. The Photographers, both Daguerreotypists and Talbotypists now take Binocular portraits, to be thrown into relief by the Stereoscope, as an important branch of their profession, and we have no doubt that the time is near at hand when no other portraits will be taken. The Sculptors too are beginning to see the application of the Stereoscope to their art, and we have recently learned from Paris, that an artist in that city has modelled a statue from the relieve produced in the Stereoscope.

Such is a brief history of the introduction of the Lenticular Stereoscope into Paris and London, and of its application to portraiture and sculpture. The Stereoscopic apparatus of Mr. Wheatstone had been before the public for upwards of twelve years, without exciting any general notice, and without any useful application being made of it; and yet when Sir David Brewster's instrument became an article of general sale in London, his Lenticular Stereoscope was sold as an invention of Mr. Wheatstone's, and with his name actually attached to it. An article appeared in the "*Illustrated News*" of January 26th, 1852, in which the Lenticular Stereoscope, as made by M. Soleil, is represented in a drawing under the name of the *Refracting Stereoscope*, as if to conceal both the nature of the instrument and the name of its inventor, and we have no hesitation in characterizing the whole article as one of the most extraordinary perversions of scientific history with which we are acquainted. The theory of the instrument is not ascribed to the person to whom we owe it. It is called a modification of an instrument to which it has no resemblance whatever, and its peculiar property of magnifying by means of semi-lenses, or quarter-lenses, the plane pictures to which it is directed, at the same time that it unites them to produce the solid, or rather the figure in three dimensions, a

* See *The Transactions of the Royal Society of Edin.* Vol. XV. Part III. pp. 349–368, and the *Phil. Magazine* for May and June 1844, Vol. XXIV., pp. 356 and 439.

property which enables us to make Microscopic Stereoscopes,* is never one mentioned.

Having thus given a brief history of the introduction of the Stereoscope, and of the general principles of Binocular Vision, which it is intended to illustrate, we shall now proceed to explain its theory and describe its construction as an instrument applicable to the advancement of the fine arts. When we look at a statue with one eye, suppose the left, and project it upon a plane surface, or draw it as seen by that eye, we shall have the left eye represented by a point which we may call *E*, the tip of the nose by a point *N*, and the chin by a point *C*. If we do the same with the right eye, without moving the head, we shall have another picture in which *e* is the left eye of the statue, *n* the nose, and *c* the chin. If we now place these two pictures side by side opposite the eyes to which they belong, we shall see in the picture obtained by the left eye more of the right side of the statue, and in the picture obtained by the right eye more of the left side of the statue. The two pictures of the statue thus taken are therefore dissimilar. The distance *Ee* between the two left eyes of the picture will be less than the distance *Nn* between the two noses, because the eyes are nearer the plane of projection than the noses, and the distance *Cc* between the two chins will be intermediate between *Ee* and *Nn*, that is $Nn > Ee$ and $Cc > Ee$. When we look at the statue with both eyes, the dissimilar pictures of it are united on the retina and seen as one. When we look at the left eye *E* of the statue, we see it distinctly and singly by converging the optic axes to the point *E*. In like manner when we see *N* distinctly and singly, we converge the optic axes to *N*; but when we have done this the point *E* is seen *double* and not so distinct as before. When we look at the statue we see only one point of it single and distinct at the same instant, but the two eyes, with the rapidity of lightning, run over every part of it, uniting the two images of that point in succession, and thus producing a general and *apparent* coalescence of the two images. In the very same manner, when we unite the two dissimilar pictures placed beside each other, either by the eyes alone or by the Stereoscope, when the pictures are interchanged we can unite only two points at once, namely, *Ee*, or *Nn*, or *Cc*, and these points are seen raised above the plane, and placed at such distances from it

as correspond with the distances, *Ee*, *Nn*, and *Cc*; that is, the nose will rise higher than the eyes, because the optic axes must unite at a greater height above the plane, in order to bring the points *N*, *n*, together. The whole of this process is distinctly represented in figs. 16 and 17 of Sir David Brewster's paper on the Law of Visible Direction, and in conformity with that law. In this, as in all the phenomena of binocular vision, we must consider all images as formed by points of the objects which they represent, and we must recollect, not merely that only one point of any object can be seen distinctly and singly at the same instant, but that in the union of dissimilar pictures, only two similar points at a certain distance can be thus united, a new convergence of the optic axes being necessary to unite any other pair of similar points.

In the case of geometrical diagrams or plane pictures consisting of lines, each inclined line of the picture seen by one eye, being less or greater than the corresponding inclined line in the picture seen by the other, the lines never coalesce, and never can by any process be made to coalesce as maintained by Wheatstone and Whewell. When the nearest end of one line coincides with the corresponding termination of the other, the remotest ends of the lines are seen separate and indistinct; and when the remotest ends coincide in a single point, the nearest ends are seen separate and indistinct. To get over a difficulty, by supposing it possible that a short line could be made to coincide at each end with a long one, would be a hypothesis of the same order, as if the astronomer were to surmount a difficulty about the tides, by supposing that the moon acted upon our seas according to the law of the squares, and the sun according to the law of the cubes of the distances. The laws of vision, in virtue of which, and the process by which, we see a solid, a body of three dimensions in space, are precisely the same as those by which we see it by the successive and rapid union of similar points of the two pictures, by a change in the convergence of the optical axis. The law or rule, according to which this vision of the solid is effected may be thus expressed:—

The various distances between all the similar points in the two plane pictures, such as the distance of the two right ears, the two right eyes, and the two noses which may be called 10, 11, 12, (10 being the shortest distance of the most prominent points,) correspond with the distances of the same points of the solid, from the eye represented by 20, 22, 24, &c., or any other numbers which measure the dis-

* By means of the Microscopic Stereoscope, Binocular Daguerreotypes for lockets and rings may be used in the instrument and magnified.

tances along the common axis of the eyes, and from the visual base of the points of convergence of the optical axes, when the points 10, 11, 12 are seen single, or united in the Lenticular Stereoscope.*

Having thus explained how two perfect binocular pictures appear exactly like the solid from which they were taken, we now come to inquire by what means such perfect pictures of a solid can be taken, so as to be accurate representations of the solid as seen by each eye. The solution of this very difficult problem has not even been attempted by Mr. Wheatstone, or any other writer. Three methods, and all of them imperfect, have been employed. After fixing upon the distance at which the statue, for example, should be viewed, a photographic picture of the statue is taken at that distance by a camera of such a focal length, as will give the picture of the required size: The camera is then shifted to a position previously ascertained, so that the view of the statue shall be the same as if it had been viewed by the right eye, the first picture being that which would be seen by the left eye, care being taken that the distance of the camera from the statue is precisely the same as before. This arrangement is easily made by drawing from the statue, upon a fixed table, lines representing the optic axes, and marking two points in those lines, equidistant from the statue; but in taking a portrait we cannot expect the sitter to maintain his position while this arrangement is going on, and while a second photograph of him is taking. To avoid this, two cameras have been employed; but as it is next to impossible to obtain two cameras which shall give two pictures of exactly the same size, and as a perfect equality of the pictures is most desirable, if not necessary, Sir David Brewster has described a binocular camera, fitted up with two semi-lenses, obtained by the bisection of a whole lens. These semi-lenses can be placed at any distance we choose, or may be put, when required, into separate cameras, and it is obvious that the pictures which they furnish will be perfectly equal. Mr. Slater of Euston Square has already constructed several of these binocular cameras, which have been sent to America. As the semi-lens will give only half the light of a whole lens, a longer time will be required to take the Daguerreotype or the Talbotype; but these processes have been so greatly accelerated that this disadvantage becomes insignificant when compared with

the advantage of obtaining two perfectly equal pictures. The semi-lenses, however, have another advantage, the statement of which will startle the Photographer. *They will give better binocular pictures than two whole lenses whose focal length is exactly the same, if two such lenses could be made.*

In order to make the reader understand this, we must write a new chapter on optics for the special benefit of the Binocular Photographer, which we trust all Photographers will be. The Daguerreotypist and the Talbotypist justly pride themselves on the size of the achromatic lenses of their cameras, on the perfection of which their superiority as artists must always depend. They will be surprised to learn, however, for the first time, that owing to the size of their lenses, even if absolutely perfect, they never can obtain a picture such as that which is seen by one or by both eyes. To explain this we must make some observations on the nature of monocular and binocular vision, that is, on vision with one or two eyes. Lord Bacon has said that we see more exquisitely with one eye shut than with both. He might have said that we see more exquisitely with one eye than with both, for it is not necessary to shut the other eye in order to obtain better vision. Mr. Wheatstone has given an explanation of this superiority of single vision, which we cannot for a moment admit. Having previously stated, that beyond the distance when the optic axes are parallel, (nearly parallel must be meant,) "we see with both eyes all objects precisely as we see near objects with a single eye," he observes, "that every one must be aware how greatly the perspective effect of a picture is enhanced by looking at it only with one eye, especially when a tube is employed to exclude the vision of adjacent objects, whose presence might disturb the illusion. Seen under such circumstances from the proper point of sight, the picture projects the same lines, shades and colours on the retina, as the more distant scene which it represents would do were it substituted for it. The appearance which would make us certain that it is a picture is excluded from the sight, and the imagination has room to be active." Now, this is really nothing more than guessing at the cause of a distinct physical fact, which demands a distinct and intelligible physical explanation. The tube has nothing whatever to do with the question, because two tubes might be used, as they often are, in binocular vision. Nor has the distance of the scene anything to do with the matter, because the proposition is true, and much more strikingly true of scenes not distant. The "appearance which would make us cer-

* These useful names have been employed by Dr. Wells, the *visual base* being the line joining the pupils of the two eyes, and the *common axis* or line drawn perpendicular to the visual base, and bisecting it from the point of convergence of the optical axes.

tain that it is a picture" is not mentioned, and even if it were "excluded from the sight," we should still be certain that it is a picture however "greatly the perspective effect of it is enhanced." We demur too, to the help of the imagination, and we demur the more, the more room that is given it to be active.

The following is, we doubt not, the true physical cause of the very interesting fact, that the perspective effect of a picture, especially of pictures in true perspective, such as those taken photographically, is best seen with one eye. When we direct both eyes to such a picture and survey its parts, the optic axes maintain throughout the same convergency, so as to prove to us that every part of the canvas or the ground of the picture is at the same distance from us. In nature the optic axes would have constantly changed their convergence as they were directed to the nearer and remoter portions of the scene. But when we look at the picture with one eye, we are deprived of the means of ascertaining that the different parts of the picture are at the same distance from the eye; and the artist's skill in aerial perspective, and in characterizing the foreground and middle distance by their proper touches, is left to make its full impression on the mind. But besides this another cause is in operation; the canvas or ground reflects light from its surface, that is the light from the walls or other objects which lie in the direction of the incident rays, which correspond with the rays reflected to each eye; and the sight of the canvas destroys the illusion. When one eye is closed the reflected light is diminished one half, and therefore the illusion is increased. A greater portion of the reflected light may be destroyed by looking through a polarizing prism, or by placing a black cloth so that the reflected picture of it may hide the whole of the canvas.

From the representations of nature on a plane let us pass to the vision of bodies of three dimensions. Here too monocular vision is superior to binocular. With one eye every part of the solid is seen with the degree of light which falls upon it, and with equal distinctness as the eye directs itself to its different parts; but with two eyes there are many parts of the solid that are seen only with one eye, while all the other parts of it are seen with both eyes, and hence the parts of it seen with one eye are only half as luminous as the other parts. If the object viewed is a six-sided pyramid, with its apex more turned to one eye than the other, there are certain positions of it in which the left eye sees only four faces of it, while the right eye sees all the six, so that the two sides seen only by one eye must be much less lu-

minous than the other faces.* But there is still another imperfection of binocular vision which requires to be mentioned. With two eyes we see more of the round of objects in lines parallel to the visual base than we do in lines perpendicular to that base, that is, more in horizontal than in vertical planes. When we view a sphere, for example, with one eye, its projection on a plane is circular, while with both eyes its projection is an oval, the large axis of the oval being horizontal. Hence we do not see the true forms of objects in binocular vision. Two eyes, however, were necessary to give beauty and symmetry to the human form, and to enable us to form a more correct estimate of distance and position; and they have the still greater advantage of preserving us from blindness when one of them is lost. The superiority of monocular vision would have been a poor compensation to Polyphemus *cui lumen ademptum*.

We are now prepared for the consideration of the influence of size in lenses over the images which they form. The object of photographic art is to obtain an accurate representation of nature, as it appears when seen either with one or with two eyes. We have already proved that with one eye a sphere is truly seen, that is, it is seen perfectly spherical, its roundness being equally well developed in all sections of it by a plane passing through its centre and the eye. The same is true of all irregular solids. The appearance of the sphere, however, and of all such solids, changes as the pupil expands. Rays from parts of the sphere, and other solids that do not enter the smaller pupil, enter the larger one, and exhibit portions of the solid not previously seen. This change of form, however, is too small to be noticed, and we may assume that we have a perfect representation of an object of three dimensions when we view it with one eye. It is such a picture as this that the artist paints, and all photographic delineations should resemble a picture thus painted. In order to produce such a picture the lens of the camera should have the same diameter as that of the pupil of the eye. Every addition to the area of the lens introduces parts of the object which have nothing to do with the picture, and when we use lenses of two, four, or six inches in diameter, we obtain, though a common eye may not discover it, monstrous representations of humanity, which no eye and no pair of eyes ever saw or can see. Every portion of the lens exterior to the central portion, the size of the human pupil, introduces parts of the picture which ought not

* See *Edin. Transactions*, vol. xv. pp. 355, 356.

to be seen. The face is enlarged all round, so as to be larger and broader than it ought. The ears are expanded, the head, nose, and chin elongated, hollows enlarged, prominences elevated, and different degrees of illumination which do not exist in the original mark the photographic picture. The likeness is therefore imperfect, and we now see the cause of defects which have hitherto been ascribed to want of steadiness in the sitter. The only remedy for such defects is to diminish the aperture of the lens to the smallest size, and the photographic art will not be perfect till we can take portraits in the shortest possible time, and with the smallest possible lenses! In order to explain this result, let us suppose that we look at a cone with its base turned to the eye, the true picture of the cone is a circle, as we see only its circular base; but if we place the cone before a camera with a large lens, and if the cone is small, so that rays from its conical surface fall upon the marginal parts of the lens, its picture will be a circle as before, surrounded with a luminous ring representing the surface of the cone. In like manner every solid will be incorrectly represented, and the resultant picture will be a combination of pictures, some as seen by binocular vision, with eyes at various distances, and some as seen by one or both eyes in different positions.

The most important application of these views is to binocular portraits as taken at the same time with the usual cameras, in order to be combined by the stereoscope. The portraits as now taken in London by professional photographers, are gross misrepresentations of the human form, *because taken with large lenses*, in order that they may be taken quickly. Each picture, which ought to be strictly monocular, is *really binocular* and much worse, so that the stereoscope unites into a monstrous solid, two binocular or worse than binocular portraits. If the sitter, for example, is placed in such a position, that his left ear is hidden from both eyes of the artist, the portrait taken by the camera on his right hand, will exhibit this ear, while the portrait taken by the camera on his left, will exhibit a portion of the head behind his ear. In like manner, the broad margin of the lens on his right hand will shew the right ear much more expanded than it should be, and also a considerable portion of the head beyond that ear. For the same reason, the upper and the under margins, and all the other margins of the lenses, will exhibit portions of the figure in vertical and all other planes, which ought not to be seen at all. When these two pictures, therefore, are united by the stereo-

scope, the resultant portrait is anything but an accurate or an agreeable representation of the individual. Hence, it is obvious, that semi-lenses, such as those in the binocular camera, will give better binocular portraits than the whole lenses of the same diameter, because the effects which we have described will be reduced in the proportion of 2 to 1 in all *horizontal sections* of the solid, the most influential sections in binocular vision. But, though semi-lenses have this advantage, their area is still too large, and photographic portraiture can be perfected only by a very great reduction in the area of the lenses employed. For statues, busts, and buildings, where quickness in the photographic process is not necessary, we should use exceedingly small lenses, and thus obtain very accurate representations of that class of objects.

Having obtained a camera fitted to give good monocular pictures, the next step is to apply it to take binocular ones. After determining the best aspect for the portrait, that is the distance and line of direction at which it should be taken, the camera must be placed in succession on each side of the line of direction, and at equal angular distances from it; or if we use two cameras, this line of direction must bisect the line of direction of the two cameras. If we call D the distance of the object from the camera, d the distance between the eyes, and A the angle subtended by the distance d , at the distance D or at the object, we shall have

$$\tan \frac{1}{2} A = \frac{d}{D} \text{ and making } d = 2\frac{1}{2} \text{ inches,}$$

we shall obtain the following values of A , or the inclination of the two lines of direction of the camera, in order to obtain pictures of the solid as seen by each eye.

Distance of the Camera from the object.	Angle formed by the two directions of the Camera.
5 feet	23° 32'
6	19 42
7	16 56
8	14 50
9	13 12
10	11 54
12	9 56
15	7 57
18	6 37
20	5 58

Having obtained the binocular portraits or pictures, the next step is to unite them, so as to reproduce the original solid. This may be done either by the eyes alone, or by a stereoscope. When we do it by the eyes alone, we must place the picture as seen by the left eye on the right side, and the picture as seen by the right eye on the left side; and if we have not the power of doubling each of the pictures by squinting, so as

to cause the two middle ones of the four to unite into one, we must do it by looking at an object nearer the eye, while we at the same time look at the two pictures. The best method, however, is to unite them with the stereoscope.

The only stereoscopic apparatus, in so far as we know, that was ever constructed for sale till recently, is that of Mr. Wheatstone. It is an apparatus rather than an instrument, and consists of two glass mirrors, each of which is *four* inches long by *three and a quarter* broad, placed at right angles to each other. The two binocular pictures are placed 16 inches from each other, so that each of them is about 7 inches from the centre of the corresponding mirror, the line joining the centre of the picture and the centre of its mirror, forming an angle of 45° with the mirror's surface. The nose of the observer being placed at the angle where the mirrors meet, each eye sees the reflected image of the picture in the mirror opposite to it, and the pictures are thus united into one, and rise into relief. We have seen this apparatus so made as to be easily taken to pieces and put into a box to render it portable; but the trouble of taking it down and putting it up again, makes it unavailable for popular use. The apparatus indeed, $16\frac{1}{2}$ inches long, by 6 inches broad, which we have now before us, as made by Ross, under the direction of Mr. Wheatstone, and which cost, we believe, 25 or 30 shillings, is so awkward and unportable, that it never excited any general interest. Besides these disadvantages of size and shape, it has many others, such as, the difficulty of getting the pictures equally illuminated, the loss of half the light by reflexion from the mirrors, and the doubling of the lines of the pictures by the two surfaces of the glass. The last of these indeed, might have been avoided by making the mirrors of black glass, which would have darkened the picture much more, or of speculum metal, which would have made the apparatus too expensive.

It was under these circumstances that Sir David Brewster invented the *Lenticular Stereoscope*, which has been ignorantly called a modification of Mr. Wheatstone's, to which it has not the slightest resemblance in any one of its features. It is the only instrument, indeed, in optics, in which *semi-lenses* or *quarter lenses* were ever used for the purposes of vision, and by this means a single lens which costs only twopence, unless when it is achromatic, is sufficient to make two lenticular stereoscopes. In this way, too, a pair of stereoscopic spectacles suggested by Sir David Brewster, as a substitute for the stereoscope, could be made for *threepence*

or *fourpence*, and yield a good profit to the manufacturer.* He constructed also a stereoscope consisting merely of the two semi-lenses, or quarter lenses, fixed in a piece of tin, and at the point between these lenses was soldered a rod of tin, upon which the binocular pictures, having a hole between them, could be moved. An instrument of this kind did not cost more than threepence or fourpence. In employing Daguerreotype pictures, it was necessary to exclude the light, and the stereoscope was, therefore, made in the form of a pyramidal box, with two eye-pieces, containing the lenses. These eye-pieces were originally made to approach or separate, in order to accommodate themselves to eyes at different distances, and the instrument had a movable bottom which, when taken out, enabled the observer to apply the instrument to objects that would not slide into its base. This was the form of the instrument constructed in brass, by Mr. Loudon, optician, Dundee, and it was from this model that M. Soleil constructed the beautiful stereoscopes of which he sent such numbers to London. In the lenticular stereoscope there is almost no loss of light, and it has the peculiar property of *magnifying the pictures at the same time that it combines them*. Besides this lenticular stereoscope, Sir David Brewster has described several others, one of which, namely, *The Total Reflexion Stereoscope*, deserves to be noticed, from its possessing the remarkable property of creating, by total reflexion, from a prism, one of the two binocular pictures to be combined. The created picture of the solid, seen by one eye, is obtained from the other picture, and is united with that other picture, as seen by the direct vision of the right eye.

Having thus given a brief account, and as popular a one as we can, without diagrams, of the history, principle, and construction of the stereoscope, we shall now endeavour to point out its application to the arts of portraiture and sculpture. After describing the manner of obtaining "dissimilar pictures of living bodies," buildings, natural scenery, machines, and objects of all kinds of three dimensions, and reproducing them by the stereoscope, so as to give the most correct idea of some of these objects to those who could not understand them in drawings of the greatest accuracy, Sir David Brewster thus concludes his article on the Binocular Camera:—

"The art which we have now described can—

* We have now before us excellent spectacles made in Birmingham, with good lenses and good frames, at the retail price of four shillings a dozen, or fourpence each!

not fail to be regarded as of inestimable value to the sculptor, the painter, and the mechanist, whatever be the nature of his production, in three dimensions. Lay figures will no longer mock the eye of the painter. He may delineate, at leisure, on his canvas, the forms of life and beauty stereotyped by the solar ray, and reconverted into the substantial objects from which they were obtained,—brilliant with the same lights, and chastened with the same shadows as the originals. The sculptor will work with similar advantages. Superficial forms will stand before him in three dimensions, and while he summons into view the living realities from which they were taken, he may avail himself of the labours of all his predecessors, of Pericles as well as of Canova; and he may virtually carry in his portfolio, the mighty lions and bulls of Nineveh, the gigantic sphinxes of Egypt, the Apollos and Venuses of Grecian art, and all the statuary and sculpture which adorn the galleries and museums of civilized nations.*

The celebrated French painter, M. Delaroche, has pointed out the advantages which photography gives to his own art. He considers it as "carrying to such perfection certain of the essential principles of art that they must become subjects of study and observation even to the most accomplished artist. The finish of inconceivable minuteness disturbs in no respect the repose of the masses, nor impairs in any manner the general effect. The correctness of the lines, and the precision of the forms in the designs of M. Daguerre, are as perfect as it is possible they can be, and yet, at the same time, we discover in them a broad and energetic manner, and a whole equally rich in tone as in effect. The painter will obtain, by this process, a quick method of making collections of studies which he could not otherwise procure without much time and labour, and in a style very far inferior, whatever in other respects might be his talents." If such, in the estimation of so competent a judge, be the advantages of photographic pictures on a plane surface, how great must be the benefit which stereoscopic photography confers upon the artist! Binocular Daguerreotypes or Talbotypes of the human face, taken under all the conditions of repose and of muscular action, and reconverted into the original solid, give a new power to the portrait and the historical painter. In place of drawing from the living object, whose different attitudes and positions he cannot, by any contrivance fix, till they are delineated, he will draw from innumerable forms fixed, as if by death, and yet exhibiting the vigour and plumpness of life. Instead of trying to catch with his pencil those evanescent and ever-varying forms, which give beauty and expression to the living subject, but whose shades and shadows are ever

shifting, as the day advances, or as the clouds are dispersed, he may study the same forms under a fixed shadow, which neither time nor circumstances can change. The plane pictures indeed, which are thus combined into solid forms, may be supposed more suited for imitation than his own drawings from the solid; but this would be to copy merely the solar picture, and not to improve himself by appealing directly to the living subject. From the stereoscopic art, too, the historical painter would derive great advantage. Groups of living figures might be taken binocularly, and reproduced for his study and imitation.*

But it is to the sculptor that the reproduction of statues from their binocular representations will be of most avail. In order to master the difficulties of his art, the sculptor must have before him, as studies, either casts or drawings of those great works of art which have immortalized their authors. The one he cannot procure, and he must therefore travel to foreign lands or to distant parts of his own country to make drawings of these works of art. However great be his powers of delineation he will find it a difficult task to record those beautiful forms and expressions on which their beauty depends. If the sun shines into the gallery where he works, even though his rays are not incident upon the statue, its shadows will not only correspond with numerous points of illumination, but will be varying every minute as the sun advances in the heavens, and as his rays fall upon objects in the apartment reflecting different quantities of light, and differently inclined to his own locality. Even in a day without sun the shadows upon his statue will imperceptibly change, and with whatever accuracy he may draw its outline he will find it impossible to transfer to his tablet those delicately convex and concave forms which can be appreciated and measured only by the length and nature of their shadows. We hold it therefore to be impossible to copy a statue, which it requires a day or a considerable portion of time to finish,—we mean, of course, to take such a copy that the artist can use it in his studio to observe the nice details of the original, and to transfer them in their real or modified character to some analogous work of art in which he is engaged. In this predicament the art of photography comes powerfully to his aid, and at one instant of time he may procure views of the statue in all its different aspects, and

* The same observations are, *mutatis mutandis*, applicable to landscape painting, where distance of space from the eye can be represented by the union of binocular pictures.

with all the shadows which variegate its surface; and by taking pictures in each aspect, by means of the binocular camera, with the smallest possible aperture, he may take right and left eyed representations of it which, when combined stereoscopically, will enable him to draw from this temporary statue all the forms of its parts with their fixed shadows, and thus to transfer to his own work the ideas which it is so well calculated to supply. We have already said that a French sculptor has upon such principles, and with such auxiliaries, actually modelled a statue. In taking busts and statues from the *living* subject the sculptor will derive pre-eminent advantage. Double pictures of the whole or of any portion of the subject may be taken and raised into relief, and from such pictures executed on one side of the globe, an artist on the other side may produce an admirable statue. The dying and the dead may thus be modelled without the rude contact of a mask, and those noble forms preserved, which affection, or gratitude, or patriotism has endeared.

But if such are the advantages which this new auxiliary to art gives to the painter and the sculptor, how are we to estimate the boon which it confers on society and on the domestic circle? We have endeavoured, in another place, to describe these advantages in reference solely to monocular photogenic pictures which represent external scenery and living objects upon a plane surface: but when we read this description, under the conviction that the scenes, and objects, and persons which are named or referred to, may, or might have been reproduced from binocular photographs, and displayed to the eye in true retiring perspective, or in the relievo forms of life and beauty, it will appeal to the judgment and the affections in a deeper tone, and with a more powerful influence.

"How limited," we have elsewhere said, "is our present knowledge of the architectural glories of other nations—of the ruined grandeur of former ages—of the gigantic ranges of the Himalaya and the Andes, and of the enchanting scenery of lakes, and rivers, and valleys, and cataracts, and volcanoes which occur throughout the world. Excepting by the labours of some travelling artists, we know them only through the sketches of hurried visitors, tricked up with false and ridiculous additions which are equally mockeries of nature and of art. But when the photographer has prepared his truthful tablet, and 'held his mirror up to nature,' she is taken captive in all her sublimity and beauty; and faithful images of her grandest, her loveliest, and her minutest

features are presented to her most distant worshippers, and become the objects of a new and fascinating idolatry. The hallowed remains which faith has consecrated in the land of Palestine, the scene of our Saviour's youth, and pilgrimage, and miracles—the endeared spots where he drew his first and his latest breath, the hills and valleys of the holy city—the giant flanks of Horeb, and the awe-inspiring peaks of Mount Sinai, will be displayed to the Christian's eye in the deep lines of truth, and appeal to his heart with all the powerful associations of an immortal interest. With feelings more subdued will the antiquary and the architect study the fragments of Egyptian, Assyrian, Grecian, and Roman grandeur—the pyramids, the temples, the aqueducts, and the obelisks of other ages. Every stone, every inscription, will exhibit to them its outline and its story. The gray moss will lift its hoary frond, and the fading hieroglyphics will utter their faltering voice and tell their mysterious tale. The fields of ancient and of modern warfare will unfold themselves to the soldier's eye in faithful perspective and unerring outline; while in his fancy reanimated squadrons will again form on the plains of Marathon, and occupy the gorge of Thermopylae.

"But it is not merely the rigid forms of art and of external nature—the mere outlines and sub-divisions of space, that are thus fixed and recorded. The self-delineated landscape is seized at one epoch of time, and is embalmed amid all the co-existing events of the social and physical world. If the sun shines, his rays throw their gilding over the scene. If the gentle shower descends, the earth and the trees glisten with its varnish. If the wind blows, we see in the partially obliterated foliage the amount of its agitation. If the air is nearly at rest, the indistinctness of the aspen leaf measures the zephyr's breath. The objects of still life, too, give animation to the scene. The streets display their stationary chariots, the esplanade its military array, and the market place its colloquial groups, while the fields and the woodlands are studded with the various forms and attitudes of life. In this manner are the incidents of time and the forms of space simultaneously recorded. Every picture becomes an authentic chapter in the history of the world, and the direction and the length of the shadow of the spire marks the season, while the shadow of the dial's gnomon points to the hour when nature has been caught in her charms.

"In considering the relations of photography to the art of portraiture, we are dis-

posed to give it a still higher rank. Could we now see in photogenic light and shade, Demosthenes launching his thunder against Macedon, or Brutus at Pompey's statue, bending over the bleeding Cæsar, or Paul preaching at Athens, or Him whom we must not name, in godlike attitude and celestial beauty, proclaiming good will to man—with what rapture would we gaze on impersonations so exciting and divine! The heroes and sages of ancient times, mortal though they were, would thus have been embalmed with more than Egyptian skill, and the forms of life and beauty, and the lineaments of glowing affections and intellectual power, the real incarnations of immortal man, would have replaced the hideous fragments of royal mortality scarcely saved from corruption.

"But even within the narrower though not less hallowed sphere of the affections, where the magic names of kindred and home are inscribed, what a thrilling interest do the realities of photography excite! In the transition forms of their offspring which link infancy with manhood, the parent will observe the traces of his own mortality, and in the successive phases which mark the sunset of life, the child in his turn will read the lesson that his pilgrimage too is destined to close.

"Nor are these delineations interesting only from their minute accuracy, or their moral influence. They are instinct with associations at once vivid and endearing:—Sensibilities peculiarly touching connect the picture with its original:—It was the very light which radiated from the hallowed brow, the identical gleam which lighted up the speaking eye, the pallid hue which hung upon the marble cheek, that pencilled the cherished image, and fixed themselves for ever there."

The subject of binocular vision is by no means restricted to the recombination of *dissimilar* plane pictures into the original solids which they represent. The union of *similar* pictures forms an interesting branch of binocular optics, and has been treated of with great fulness by Sir David Brewster in the article "On the Knowledge of Distance given by Binocular Vision." This class of phenomena are best seen by using a numerous series of plane figures, such as those of flowers, or geometrical patterns upon paper hangings or carpets. These figures being always at equal distances from one another, and almost perfectly equal and similar, the coalescence of any pair of them, effected by directing the optic axis to a point between the paper-hanging and the eye, is accompanied by the coalescence of every other pair.

If we therefore look at a papered wall without pictures, or doors, or windows, at the distance of three feet, and unite two of the figures—flowers for example—at the distance of twelve inches from each other, the whole wall will appear covered with flowers as before, but as each flower is composed of two flowers united at the point of convergence of the optical axes, *the whole papered wall, with all its flowers*, (in place of being seen, as in ordinary vision, at the distance of three feet,) *is seen suspended in the air at the distance of six inches from the observer*. At first the observer does not decide upon the distance of the suspended wall from himself. It generally advances from the wall to its new position, and when it has taken its place it has a very singular character. The surface of it seems slightly curved. It has a silvery transparent aspect. It is more beautiful than the real paper, and it moves with the slightest motion of the head. If the observer, who is now three feet from the wall, retires farther from it, the suspended wall of flowers will follow him, moving farther and farther from the real wall, and also, but very slightly, farther and farther from the observer. When the observer stands still, and the picture is suspended before him, he may stretch out his hand and place it on the other side of the picture or wall, and even hold a candle on the other side of it, so as to satisfy himself that the suspended paper wall stands between his hand and himself.* This is a true pseudoscopic phenomenon, in which the nearest of two objects appears the most distant.

In looking attentively at this picture some of the flowers have the appearance of real flowers. In some the stalk retires from the plane of the picture; in others it rises above it; one leaf will come farther out than another; one coloured portion, *red* for example, will be more in relief than the blue, and the flower will then appear thicker and more solid, resembling a real flower compressed, and deviating considerably from the plane representation of it as seen by one eye. All this arises from slight and accidental differences of distance in similar parts of the united figures. If the distance, for example, between two corresponding leaves is greater than the distance between other two corre-

* Errors in the construction of complex geometrical diagrams may be detected by this process. These errors, or rather unavoidable imperfections, arise partly from the points of the compasses sinking into different depths in the paper, and from the difficulty of making a number of lines pass through the same point. This effect is finely seen in the diagram of the homogeneous curve which forms plate IX. of Mr. Hay's work "On the Harmony of Form."

sponding leaves, then the two first, when united, will appear nearer the eye than the other two, and hence the appearance of a solid flower is partially given to the combination.

In surveying the suspended image another remarkable phenomenon often presents itself;—a part of one of the pieces of paper, and sometimes a whole stripe, from the roof to the floor, will retire behind the general plane of the image, as if there were a recess in the wall, or rise above it as if there were a projection, thus displaying on a large scale an imperfection in the workmanship which it would otherwise have been difficult to discover. This defect arises from the paper-hanger having cut off too much of the white margin of one or more of the adjoining stripes or pieces, or leaving too much of it, so that in the first case, when the two halves of a flower are joined together, part of the middle of the flower is left out, and hence when this defective flower is united binocularly with the one on the right hand of it, and the one on the left hand united with the defective one, the united or corresponding portion being at a less distance, will appear farther from the eye than those parts of the suspended image composed of complete flowers. The opposite effect will be produced when the two portions of the flowers are not brought together, but separated by a small space. We have, therefore, by means of this result, an accurate method of discovering defects in the workmanship of paper-hangers, carpet-makers, painters, and all artists whose profession it is to combine a series of similar patterns, in order to form a uniformly ornamented surface. The smallest defect in the similarity and equality of the figures or lines which compose a pattern, and any difference in the distance of single figures, is instantly detected, and, what is very remarkable, a small inequality of distance in a line perpendicular to the axis of vision, or in one dimension of space, is exhibited in a magnified form, as a distance coincident with the axis of vision, and in an opposite dimension of space.

A little practice will enable the observer to realize, and to maintain the singular binocular picture which replaces the real one. The occasional retention of the picture after one eye is closed, and even after both have been closed and reopened, shews the influence of time over the dissolution, as well as over the creation of this class of phenomena. On some occasions a singular effect is produced, which is thus described by Sir David Brewster:—"When the flowers on the paper are distant six inches, we may either unite *two six* inches distant, or *two twelve*

inches distant. In the latter case, when the eyes have been accustomed to survey the suspended picture, I have found, that after shutting and opening them, I neither saw the picture formed by the two flowers, twelve inches distant, nor the papered wall itself, but a picture formed, by uniting all the flowers *six* inches distant! The binocular centre (the point to which the optic axes converged, and consequently the locality of the picture) had shifted its place, and instead of advancing to the wall, as is generally the case, and giving an ordinary vision of the wall, it advanced exactly as much as to unite the nearest flowers, just as in a ratchet wheel the detent stops one tooth at a time; or, to speak more correctly, the binocular centre advanced in order to relieve the eyes from their strain, and when the eyes were opened, it had just reached that point which corresponded with the union of the flowers *six* inches distant."

The phenomenon of a suspended paper wall removed *beyond* the real wall, would be exhibited, could we fix the binocular centre on a point beyond the wall, so as to unite the flowers as before. The opacity of the wall does not permit this, but we may make the same experiment by looking through transparent patterns cut out of paper, or metal, or a particular kind of trellis work, or windows with small lozenges; but the readiest pattern is the cane bottom of a chair placed upon a table, the height of the eye, with the cane bottom in a vertical plane. If the observer, pressing his two hands against the cane bottom, directs his optic axes to a point beyond the chair, or doubles the picture of the cane bottom till he unites the open patterns, as he formerly did the flowers, he will then see the cane bottom suspended in front of the real cane bottom upon which his hands press, and which is absolutely invisible. He *actually feels what he does not see, and sees what he does not feel*. If he feels the real cane bottom all over, with the palms of his hands, the result will be the same. No knowledge derived from touch, no measurement of real distances, no actual demonstration from previous or subsequent vision, that there is a real body which his hands touch, and nothing at all where he sees it, can remove or even shake the infallible conviction of the sense of sight, that the cane bottom is *where he sees it*, and at the distance at which he sees it.

In the body of his paper, Sir David Brewster states it as a remarkable circumstance, that no examples have been recorded of false estimates of the distance of near objects, in consequence of the accidental binocular union of similar images; but after his paper had

been read, the two following interesting cases, given in an appendix, were communicated to him :—

"A gentleman who had taken too much wine saw, when in a papered room, the wall suspended near him in the air." . . . "Some years ago," says Dr. Christion, in a letter to the author, "when I resided in a house, where several rooms are papered, with rather formally recurring patterns, and one, in particular, with stars only, I used, occasionally, to be much plagued with the wall suddenly standing out upon me, and waving, as you describe, with the movements of the head. I was sensible that the cause was an error as to the point of union of the visual axes of the two eyes; but I remember it sometimes cost me a considerable effort to rectify the error; and I found that the best way was to increase still more the deviation in the first instance. As this accident occurred most frequently while I was recovering from a severe attack of fever, I thought my near-sighted eyes were threatened with some new mischief; and this opinion was justified in finding, that after removal to my present house,—where, however, the papers have no very formal patterns.—no such occurrence has ever taken place. The reason is now easily understood from your researches."—*Edin. Trans.* vol. xv. p. 675.

From this department of binocular vision some practical results may be deduced. In the decoration of apartments, both private and public, and in the dresses both of males and females, patterns, consisting of the regular recurrence of small figures, or of narrow stripes, at short distances, should be carefully avoided; and when it is deemed necessary to adopt some regularly recurring figure, they should be placed at such a distance that the two nearest could not be readily united by the convergency of the optical axes. When the patterns consist of small squares, as in the plaid dresses now so common, the observer cannot avoid uniting some of these squares, and thus causing a portion of the dress, and consequently of the part which it covers, to bulge out beyond its proper place. In such cases the eyes are distracted by the sight, and actually suffer pain in the vision of surfaces so unnecessarily subdivided.

Hitherto we have studied the union of dissimilar and similar figures viewed in a direction perpendicular to the plane in which they are drawn, but a series of very curious results have been recently published by Sir David Brewster, on the union of the images of lines meeting at an angular point, when the eye is placed at different heights above the plane of the paper, and at different distances from the angular point. In these experiments, two lines, or two binocular or plane pictures, forming an angle with each other, can be united by the eye or by the

stereoscope, so as to exhibit a single object inclined at any angle we choose, on the ground on which they appear, from 90° to 180° , their apparent magnitude diminishing as they advance towards the end of their quadrantal motion. This remarkable effect, which cannot be well explained without diagrams, admits of being made a very popular exhibition.*

It would be unprofitable to devote any more of our space to this branch of the subject. Those who have occupied themselves with the study of binocular vision, have necessarily observed many phenomena which, though highly interesting, it would be too tedious to describe. Sir David Brewster has indicated in the following passage several of these phenomena, which others may have also seen, and which, no doubt, will be brought forward by subsequent observers as new discoveries :—"In the course," says he, "of the investigation which I have now brought to a close, I have had occasion to observe several interesting phenomena which it would be out of place to describe at present. They relate partly to the effects produced by uniting unequal and dissimilar pictures which have a tendency to represent incompatible solids;—to the union of dissimilar pictures where the parts of the solid lie wholly or principally in a plane perpendicular to a line joining the eyes and the object, and to the plane of the optic axes;†—to the union of pictures, one of which is more or less turned round in its own plane;—to the phenomena exhibited by uniting the images of two similar real solids, the one elevated and the other depressed; to the union of dissimilar plane figures which should at the same time give a solid in relief, and in the converse of relief;‡ and to the union of portions of dissimilar figures, those which are wanting in the one figure existing in the other. Among the singular effects produced under these various conditions, nothing is more remarkable than the tendency or desire, as it were, of the eyes to unite and fix the two pictures hovering before them, and convert them into some figure of three dimensions, (sometimes in relief, sometimes in the converse, sometimes in both at the same time); and the suddenness with which the images start into union, give birth to a solid figure, on which the optic axes are con-

* *Edinburgh Transactions*, vol. xv. pp. 667–671.

† Such as the magnified teeth of a saw or a thin section of a hexagonal prism, whose axis is parallel to a line joining the eyes and the object.

‡ In order to produce simultaneously this double effect, the lines of the pyramid, for example, which are to give the converse of relief, should be fainter than the other lines, or in different and feebler colours.

verged,—and release the eyes from that unnatural condition in which they had previously been placed.”

We come now to another branch of the subject of binocular vision, which possesses a very high degree of interest, namely, what has been improperly called the converse or conversion of relief, an effect which is shewn in the conversion of cameos into intaglios, and of intaglios into cameos, by inverted vision either with one or two eyes. This subject has been hitherto treated as one of monocular vision, but the influence of two eyes over the phenomena has been recently studied by Sir David Brewster in his paper “On the Conversion of Relief by Inverted Vision.” It had hitherto been believed, that the first notice of the remarkable fact of the conversion of an intaglio or hollow seal, into a cameo or a raised one, was published in the *Philosophical Transactions* by Dr. Philip Gmelin of Wurtemberg in 1744; but we have found a very interesting account of the principal phenomena in Aguilonius’s *Opticorum Sex Libri* already referred to. After proving that convex and concave surfaces appear plane when seen at a considerable distance, he then goes on to shew that the same surface when seen at a moderate distance frequently appear *converse*, that is the concave convex, and the convex concave. This conversion of forms, he says, is often seen in the globes or balls which are fixed on the walls of fortifications, and he ascribes the phenomena to the circumstance of the mind being imposed upon, by not knowing in what direction the light which illuminates the body reaches it. He states, that a concavity differs from a convexity only in this respect, that if the shadow is on the same side as that from which the light comes it is a concavity, and if it is on the opposite side it is a convexity. Aguilonius remarks also, that in pictures imitating nature, a similar mistake is committed as to the form of surfaces. He supposes that a circle is drawn upon a table and shaded on one side, so as to represent a convex or a concave surface: when this shaded circle is seen at a great distance it appears a plane surface, notwithstanding the shadow which it contains. But if we view it at a short distance, and suppose the light to come from the same side as the part not in shadow, the plane circle will appear to be convex, and if we suppose the light to come from the same side as the shaded part, the circle will appear to be a concavity.

In these experiments of Aguilonius the mind alone acts, and deceives us. There is no physical change in the conditions of the light or of the eye of the observer, such as we shall have presently to consider. Sir

David Brewster, who had not seen the observations of Aguilonius which are now here published for the first time in English, and which have been noticed by no writer on the subject either foreign or domestic, made a number of experiments on the influence of the mind in thus deceiving itself, not upon artificially shaded planes as Aguilonius did, but upon real concavities and convexities, and obtained some singular results. “If we take,” says he, “one of the intaglio moulds (about three or four inches long) used for making the bas-relief of that able artist Mr. Henning, and direct the eye to it steadily without noticing surrounding objects, we may coax ourselves into the belief that the intaglio is actually a bas-relief. It is difficult at first to produce the deception, but a little practice never fails to accomplish it. We have succeeded in carrying this deception so far, as to be able by the eye alone to raise a complete *hollow* mask of the human face (the size of life) into a projecting head. In order to do this we must exclude the vision of other objects, and also the margin or thickness of the cast. This experiment cannot fail to produce a very great degree of surprise to those who succeed in it; and it will, no doubt, be regarded by the sculptor, who can use it, as a great auxiliary in his art.”*

This remarkable phenomenon was observed by the same author in four other cases where the mind and the unassisted eye of the observer were alone employed. In the mineral called *Hammered Agate*, the name is derived from the dimples or apparently concave round spots which cover it, as if they had been produced by the blows of a hammer. The concavity of these spots arises from the edge *opposite to the light* being always the most luminous, and as this can take place only in concavities, these spots have the appearance of being hollow. The same thing takes place on whatever side we place the light. The same fact is frequently exhibited by the round sections of knots in highly polished tables of mahogany and other woods. When the eye is placed so that the line joining it and the knot forms a great angle with the surface of the table, the side next the light is dark, while the side opposite to it is light, and consequently the section of the knot appears to be hollow.† The same thing is finely seen in mother-of-pearl. Owing to this property of transparent bodies, it is obvious that in alabaster and partially transparent marble busts, a de-

* *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, Jan. 1826, vol. iv. p. 108.

† *Ibid.* p. 106. In the passage here referred to there is a mistake respecting the side of the knot, which the intelligent reader will easily correct.

pression and elevation cannot be too truly represented, an observation which merits the attention of the sculptor. Other two illusions of an analogous character are described in the same paper. In one of these, the clustered columns of a Gothic pillar sunk into hollow fluting, and in another, a field of wheat viewed through an erecting telescope, when illuminated by the setting sun, exhibited the strange appearance of having been trenched, and of the wheat growing in the trenches as well as upon the elevated beds between them, an effect which would have perplexed the painter had such a conversion of form formed part of his picture. Another example of this class of illusions is given by Dr. Joseph Wolff in his *Journal*.* "Lady Georgiana," says he, "observed a curious optical deception in the sand about the middle of the day, when the sun was strong; *all the foot-prints and other marks that are indented in the sand, had the appearance of being raised out of it*; at these times there was such a glare that it was unpleasant for the eye."

Dr. Gmelin of Wurtemberg, describes these illusions as seen under a different condition. He had learned from a friend, "that if a common seal was applied to the focus of a compound microscope or optical tube, which has two or three convex or plano-convex lenses, that part which is cut the deepest in it would appear very convex, and so on the contrary; and that sometimes, but very seldom, it would appear in the same state as to the naked eye." Dr. Gmelin found these results to be true, and he extended them considerably. He found, however, that friends who assisted him saw often the very converse of what he saw, and that on a darker day he could not see what he had seen the day before. He concluded, however, that all these fallacies were owing to shadow, and "that when the raised object was so placed between the windows that *it must be illuminated on all sides*, it did not change its convexity. Mr. Rittenhouse, in 1780, explained these illusions by the inversion of the shadow by means of the inverting eye-tube. He used an eye-piece with two lenses placed at a distance greater than the sum of their focal lengths, and "by throwing a reflected light on the cavities observed, in a direction opposite to that of the light which came from his window, he was able to see them raised into elevations by looking through a tube without any lens. This, however, was still seeing them by inverted vision, for he inverted the shadows,

though his tube did not invert the objects themselves.

Our limits will not permit us to describe the various interesting changes, apparently very capricious, which take place by introducing into the field of view, a pin whose shadow shews a new direction of the illuminating body, or by combining the sensations of touch with those of vision.* We shall confine ourselves to a notice of the *Single* and the *Binocular Cameoscope*, for converting cameos into intaglios, and generally for altering, optically, the forms and inverting the distances of bodies. The *Single cameoscope* consists of two lenses, achromatic if possible, of short focus, placed like the optical tube of Gmelin, at nearly the sum of their focal distances. If the lenses are equal they will have no magnifying power, and if magnifying power is desired, one of the lenses must have a shorter focus than the other. With this instrument convex bodies appear concave, and concave convex, near objects are placed at a distance, and many other illusions are produced which are very interesting. The *Binocular Cameoscope* consists of two of these little inverting telescopes placed together exactly like a double opera glass, so that whatever is seen by the one is seen by the other. With this instrument we combine the effects produced by the inversion of the solid with the stereoscopic effect arising from the binocular pictures which are combined by the instrument. We observe in the newspapers that an instrument to which Mr. Wheatstone gives the name of *Pseudoscope* is advertised for sale, and we see in the article already referred to in the *Illustrated News*, that it shews the same effects as those which are shown in the cameoscope. We have now before us one of these pseudoscopes, but we have seen no other account of it but the notice of its effects. It is a most capricious and unsatisfactory instrument, which often fails to shew what it ought to shew. It seems to us to differ in nothing from the cameoscope excepting that the inversion of the objects and their double pictures are produced by two reflecting prisms in place of lenses, the inversion of the prisms being an inversion only in a direction parallel to the line joining the eyes of the observer, whereas in the *binocular cameoscope* the inversion is in every direction. The inversion of the picture by means of prisms is precisely the same as that which is used in the *total reflect-*

* An account of these experiments will be found in Sir David Brewster's *Letters on Natural Magic*, and the theory of the conversion of relief, in his *Memoir* on that subject, referred to in the list at the head of this article.

tion stereoscope already referred to. It is not easy to get two prisms properly ground to throw the two images exactly together. In the instrument which we recently got from a skilful London optician, not only was one of the prisms made of glass filled with striæ, but owing to the incorrect position of the rectangular faces of the two prisms, the one image could not be brought to lie upon the other. An instrument with lenses is therefore much more appropriate and correct.

In our list of papers at the head of this article we have referred to one on the *chromatic stereoscope*. When we look at the coloured boundary lines of a map through the opposite edges of a reading glass $2\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter or more, the lines rise in relief from the paper. Sir David Brewster was thus led to construct *chromatic stereoscopes* in which relief was obtained by difference of colour alone. The same relief takes place in unassisted vision, but in a much less degree. The effect, however, is such as to hold out an important lesson to the artist in the management of his colours, as he must take care to make them correspond with the distance of the parts of the picture to which they are applied. We expect to see binocular pictures for the lenticular stereoscope executed by Mr. Baxter's beautiful process of oil painting, as well as other pictures for exhibiting the curious effects of the chromatic stereoscope.

The laws of binocular vision, when studied in all their generality, throw much light upon many physical and metaphysical questions of high importance. They enable us to place in its true light the celebrated theory of vision on which Bishop Berkeley reared the ideal philosophy of which he was the founder; and they give us powerful aid in explaining many physical phenomena which have baffled the ingenuity of philosophers. It would be out of place to give any account of these at present, but there is one so remarkable, and at the same time so instructive as to merit special notice. In order to exhibit solids in relief, and hollow at the same time, Sir David Brewster effected this by three drawings in the same straight line, so executed that the left hand one and the middle one gave the *hollow cone*, and the middle one and the right hand one the *raised cone*. The cones having their summits truncated exhibit circles either at the bottom of the hollow, or at the top of the raised cone, and when these are placed in an *open lenticular stereoscope*, so that we can see not only the hollow and the raised cones, but the flat drawing on each side of them, we are enabled to give an ocular and experimental proof of the cause of the large size of the

horizontal moon, of her small size when in the meridian at a high altitude, and of her intermediate apparent magnitude at an intermediate altitude.

As the summit of the raised cone *appears* to be nearest the eye of the observer, the summit of the hollow cone farthest off, and that of the flat drawing on each side at an intermediate distance, these distances will represent the apparent distance of the moon in the zenith of the elliptical celestial vault, in the horizon, and at an altitude of 45° . The circular summits thus seen are in reality exactly of the same size, and at the same distance from the eye, and are therefore precisely in the same circumstances as the moon in the three positions already mentioned. If we now contemplate them in the lenticular stereoscope, we shall see the circular summit of the hollow cone the *largest*, like the *horizontal* moon, because it seems at the *greatest* distance from the eye; the circular summit of the *raised* cone the *smallest*, because it appears at the *least* distance, like the *zenith* moon; and the circular summit of the cones on each of an *intermediate* size; like the moon at an altitude of 45° , because their distance from the eye is intermediate. This effect will be distinctly seen, by placing three small wafers of the same size and colour on the square summits of the drawings of the cones or four-sided pyramids. No change is produced in the apparent magnitude of these circles by making one or more of them less bright than the rest, and hence we see the incorrectness of the explanation of the size of the horizontal moon, as given by Dr. Berkeley.

The only other topic which the subject of this article requires us to notice is what has been called *Binocular Perspective*, in an ingenious article under that name, by James Hall, Esq., in the Art Journal. Mr. Hall is well acquainted with the laws of distinct vision, and of single vision with two eyes, but in his application of them to painting and perspective he has not succeeded in giving "the true theory of a picture, which he is convinced has *never yet* been expounded." Before we can determine its true theory, we must first decide what a picture is—a landscape, for example. It is a portion of natural scenery which we see and survey in all its parts. We might see it by directing both eyes to a feature in its centre, without moving them, or the point of convergence of their axes, from a fixed position. In such a case the theory of the picture would be, that this central feature would alone be seen *singly* and distinctly, while every other point would be seen double and indistinct,—indistinct from the duplication of the lines, and

indistinct from the different distances of its parts from the eye. The lines of the painting, though known to be double, are never seen double, and therefore can be expressed only by a particular kind of indistinctness which we have tried in vain to observe, and which we believe no artist can convey to his canvas. But supposing that he could, his foreground would be exceedingly blurred and indistinct; curious optical phenomena, arising from the intersection of the curved and rectilineal branches of trunks of trees, would characterize the right and left sides of the foreground, and something quite ridiculous would be the result of such a combination. The middle and the background would display similar combinations of light and shadow, and the picture, when completed, could be tolerated only when the spectator placed himself before it, and looked at the canvas in the very way in which the artist had viewed and painted it. But when we look at nature in her grandeur and beauty, the eyes range with the rapidity of lightning over all its parts, converging its optical axes upon every point, readjusting their focus to each point in succession, now admiring the cloud-capt tower, now the gorgeous palace, now the picturesque hamlet, now the cattle grazing in the meadow, now the stream and the waterfall, now the impending boughs and the gigantic trunks which almost overhang and touch him, now starting to the far distance, and taking cognizance of the evanescent outline which mingles with the sky. By an act of the memory, and the rapid return of the eye to renew the impression, he surveys and sees, in one field of view, the various parts of the scene with the same distinctness. Setting aside, therefore, all consideration of aerial perspective, it is the duty of the painter to delineate every part of the picture with the same distinctness with which he sees it, whether it be foreground, or middle-ground, or distance; and when such a picture is hung up, and the object of admiration, the observer runs his eye over all its parts, and obtains the very representation of the scene which was drawn by the artist.

So long ago as 1828, Mr. Hall drew up a paper on this subject for the Royal Society of Edinburgh, but never communicated it. The following is his own abstract of it; and such of our readers as wish to see copious extracts from the paper itself will find them in the Art Journal for March 1852:—

“The true theory of a picture I believe to be as follows: Having fixed upon a particular view of an object, at a distance calculated to show it off to the greatest advantage, let us imagine a vertical plane to pass through the principal part of the object chosen; a plane right opposite the

spectator, and parallel to the line which joins the centres of his two eyes.

“All work, whether portrait, history, landscape, or miniature, ought, I conceive, to be *first constructed of the full size of life or nature* on this imaginary vertical plane passing through the principal part of the principal object, and so as to take into account the spectator's *two eyes*, which eyes are, of course, supposed to be adjusted for the principal object.*

“All due allowance being thus made for the two eyes, the next step, for either portrait or landscape, is to reduce the whole to a miniature, retaining all the duplications and ‘regulated obscurities’ in strictly the same proportions as in the large-scale picture.

“We have been taught heretofore that a picture is produced by intercepting the rays from an object to *one* of the spectator's eyes, upon a vertical plane interposed between the spectator and the object; which theory of *perspective*, though strictly demonstrable as any proposition in Euclid, for the circumstances supposed, has yet two capital defects. First, that its results are always necessarily less than the size of nature; and, secondly, that no account is taken of the spectator's two eyes, which is, however, one of the most important provisions in our economy for enabling us to judge of the relative distance and magnitude of near objects.

“The law of distinct and single vision with two eyes, by the concurrence of the optic axes at any given point, has long been perfectly known, but its application to painting and perspective appears to have been hitherto entirely overlooked or evaded.

“The operation of the law to painting is chiefly upon the background and retiring portions in portrait and history, and chiefly upon the foreground in landscape; the foreground in landscape and the background in portrait being, respectively, amongst the greatest of all the difficulties and perplexities that embarrass the student, and even the practised master.

“The production of roundness and relief, in place of hardness and flatness, is chiefly the result of our using both our eyes in painting; which is likewise, I am persuaded, the key to the subordination of parts, or what the painters call ‘breadth’ and ‘keeping,’ and is one of the main secrets for the production of A WHOLE.”

In perusing this passage, and the extracts from the original paper, it seems to us very manifest that Mr. Hall was well acquainted with the fact that the pictures in each eye of the artist were dissimilar, and that roundness and solidity were, as Harris remarks, the result of the union of the two dissimilar pictures.

* Mr. Hall has forgotten that when the eyes are directed to the principal object in the landscape, objects seen laterally will vanish and reappear in succession.

ART. VIII.—*Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Thomas Chalmers, D.D., LL.D.* By his Son-in-law, the REV. WILLIAM HANNA, LL.D. Four volumes 8vo., 1850–52.

It may well be supposed that the readers of the NORTH BRITISH REVIEW have already perused the volumes before us, or even if there should be a few exceptions, we shall not think ourselves called upon to turn out of our path on the account of such, and should feel it to be an impertinence to occupy the space allotted to this article in that manner which may be quite proper in ordinary instances, when volumes of memoirs come under review. Our readers, in this present instance, will not ask us either to furnish a condensed memoir of him who is the subject of these volumes, or to bring forward copious extracts from them, as samples of the matter which they contain. Such extracts from Dr. Hanna's pages as we may introduce will be selected with a view to a purpose of a more general kind.

Very little ambiguity can attach to those cases, rare as they must be, in which the man of an epoch comes to take his place in the company of historic persons: there can be little risk of mistake on any such occasion. Let it be supposed either that we were intending to compile the history of the country that boasts of him, during the period of his public life—such a history must bring forward his name on almost every page; or, on the other hand, if we were composing a memoir of the man—this biography could differ little from the history of his times; at least in relation to those of its interests with which principally he had to do.

Can we be wrong in saying that THOMAS CHALMERS was one of these EPOCH PERSONS—that he was the man whose mind and soul, whose energies and opinions, and whose public conduct, so impressed his personal image upon the religious and moral aspects of his country, as that his likeness can never be thence effaced, nor himself forgotten? A century or two hence it will not be that the name of CHALMERS has gone to its final resting-place in forgotten books. The youth of Scotland, some hundred years on, will not be putting any such question as this to their sires—"Thomas Chalmers!—who was he?" The religious cottager of Scotland's remotest glens, after a generation or two has passed away, will not need to be told that he owes an endless debt of love and reverence to the memory of Thomas Chalmers. None of these things will happen; or not unless social catastrophes shall

in the interval sweep Scotland clean of its true heart, its fervent mind, and its retentive memory! Scotland, we think, will forget Chalmers when it has forgotten KNOX, and when it forgets the worthies of its age of martyrs; or to say what we mean in a word, when Scotland shall be Scotland no more.

In thus speaking, we (let the writer just say it) are not borne aloft above the level of sobriety by the prejudices of national feeling;—for *we* are not of North Britain; nor again do we lose sight of cold realities, blinded by exaggerated notions of Dr. Chalmers's merits, powers, or accomplishments, as a philosopher, or as a writer, or as a statesman. We shall use no disguise in showing our entire freedom from any such tumid suppositions, as to the precise place which should be assigned him in some of the above-named characters. There may be room here for differences of opinion, and our own opinion may differ a little, in certain respects, from that of his most ardent admirers, or of his countrymen generally; but among those—at least among any whose happiness it may have been to pass an entire day in his company, there will be no difference of opinion when we say—THOMAS CHALMERS was a Great Man. All the characteristics of genuine greatness marked him as he stood among others. It was not that he surpassed all men around him in pure intelligence, or in any single element of moral excellence; but, taken altogether, mind and heart, and visible bearing—you gave him involuntarily, and he naturally took, the foremost position in almost any assemblage of notable persons with whom he had to do. The unassumingness of a child did not avail to screen him from that homage of which he was the object. The admitted merits and talents of others, on the right hand or the left, did not render that homage ambiguous—did not abate it. There might often be men near him who surpassed him in talent, but they did not dislodge him, in the view of others, from his place.

All was harmony in CHALMERS's conformation. His figure and attitude very nearly accorded with the IDEAL of such a man, after Michael Angelo; and if it showed a rusticity to which that great artist would have applied his chisel, there was beneath the rugged surface a refinement, an intellectuality, to which only the hand of Raphaele could have given expression. On an occasion dating not many days before his death, he stood in the midst of a company—urging an argument—with hands uplifted, just as a Michael Angelo, or a Raphaele, might

have wished to catch him when in search of a study. With his broad build, and square massive contour—shoulders, cranium, *chevelure* and all, he seemed to take immovable possession of the ground that sustained his weight—not in elegant antithesis of limb to limb—not in easy mobile equipoise of the person, as if floating in air; but solidly, and as if really he had a muscular consciousness of the round world beneath him, and stood, statue-like, surmounting its great curvatures. Yet this man of mass and weight was flexible toward every human sympathy. He remembered you, even as to the items of your individual and domestic weal; he felt with you; and in a moment he was on your level; he was courteous as the most polished; genuine and sincere as the most home-bred. He was firm as man should be, loving as woman, transparent as a child.

We have said, that whatever abatements there might be room to make on certain grounds, THOMAS CHALMERS was a Great Man. And what does this greatness which we claim for him imply? It has these elements: *first*, it implies amplitude of soul in the three dimensions of height, depth, and breadth; and what we mean is this.—He who is great, intellectually, and morally, has a stature *loftier* than that of other men, so that he commands a clearer view of the high heavens above him; and, so that his thoughts tend thither, as if by a spontaneous upward gravitation. Leave him alone at any time, distract him not with the things of earth, let his soul go whither it would go—whither it is wont to go, and you will be sure to find that he is conversing with the upper world—that he has soared—not, indeed, as if to spurn the earth, but as if to bespeak his entrance upon heaven. That we may show that we do not thus speak of Chalmers at the impulse of a mindless inflation, we say his mind had this altitude more by moral instinct, or *tendency*, than absolutely by intellectual stature; and thus also *depth* was his. John Foster's depth was that which makes a man tranquilly at home while treading, or exploring, the lowest profound of sombre meditation. Chalmers's depth was not of this sort: he was far too buoyant in temper to follow easily where Foster went; but he could approach the brink of the abyss, and gaze into that chaos, long enough to bring thence a settled solemnity of spirit, an awe, a seriousness, that gave force to his every energy while labouring for the good of his fellow-men.

Breadth, that other characteristic of greatness, most conspicuously belonged to Chalmers, both in mind and heart. Whe-

ther or not we go with him in his doctrines, as a political economist, or as an ecclesiastical theorist, the view he took of social interests was always wide, comprehensive, statesmanlike. Right or wrong in his principles, it was never a narrow ground that he occupied: never was it a pinched-in aspect of things that held his attention. He thought of INSTITUTIONS with approval, or with disapproval, according to their bearing, in *his* view, upon the social system at large. In heart, and as to his sympathies, his benign affections, his hopeful temperament, his laborious benevolence, his scorning of selfish cavils, and over-caution, when good on a great scale might be done, or attempted, what breadth of soul was his! How wide was that bosom! So wide was it, that within its compass, thoughts and purposes embracing the welfare of the human family, found their constant home and lodgement! In breadth of soul, even more than in height or depth, Chalmers was great. Great, also, in that further characteristic, so constant in all the instances to which, with a spontaneous readiness, we apply the term:—that is to say, MOMENTUM. He to whom this property belongs, how mild soever he may be in temper, and even if he be sweet-natured as a child, yet inspires, among all around him, not merely respect and awe, but a sort of dread;—for one feels, that to stand in his path, or to hold up the hand, as if to beckon him to stop in his course, is to risk, for one's-self, the being crushed. A mass, ample in its dimensions, is in rapid movement;—it is speeding itself onward by its own forces:—it is power in progress: it will not easily be turned aside; it will not wait for the tardy, for the inert, for the half-hearted, for the double-minded.

Nearly allied to this onward force, this *momentum*, was that UNITY OF INTENTION, or moral homogeneity, which is the mark, always, of men of a high order—or, as we say, of Great Men; and Chalmers had it. This does not mean that there is a paucity of ingredients in the intellectual and moral structure of the man; but that all faculties, intellectual and moral, take a single direction, and obey a sovereign and unresisted law. One's recollections of some men, known and conversed with on very different occasions, do not cohere: it is easier to frame two or three ideal men out of those recollections, than to cluster them into one. One's recollection of some men is simple and uniform, just because it is poor and meagre; but Chalmers lives in the memory, as do certain images of natural objects, which are great, bright, rich, and yet all of a piece:—so it is that one thinks

of a sunset in the tropics, with its flaming arches over head, and its burning fringes in the West; so one thinks of the heaving of the ocean, seen in a windless swell, midway of the Atlantic; so of an Alpine precipice, when a curtain of cloud is hastily drawn up from its foot to its snowy summit.

There is yet one other feature of greatness—and in how signal a degree did it belong to Thomas Chalmers! this was the transparent simplicity of his nature. What this means, is not the contrary of duplicity; it is not precisely, or it is not merely, guilelessness and probity in speech and feeling; but rather it is the opposite of what is factitious in mind and manner. Most of us would suffer great loss if all that is conventional were, by some rude hand, torn away from us;—and as to some men, what would there be left of them at all, but a shred, if *they*, and the *conventional*, were rent asunder! Chalmers's simplicity was that of a full-fraught soul, that has worked out, from, and for itself, all that is; all that it wants, as to its impulses, sentiments, and principles of action. In *character* he had not derived himself from other men's notions, or listened to their dictation: he was home-spun; this was his simplicity. As to speculative principles—or his philosophy, or his notions of abstract theology, we do not intend to claim for him a foremost place among those who have wrought at the forge of thought, in every case for themselves, and who have borrowed nothing from others.

Robust, forceful, impulsive, as nature had made him, he was also, by constitution, as all men are upon whose shoulders great public cares are to come—self-confiding, self-esteeming, highly susceptible of ambition, covetous of applause, impatient of control, and irritable;—he was a man not to be sported with. Such, we think, was he by *temperament*; and thus the reader of his early journal and letters cannot fail to think of the “Mr. Thomas Chalmers” who is therein depicted; and the thoughtful reader of the first volume of these Memoirs will judge indulgently of that feeling, on the part of the Editor, which has given place to these personal materials so copiously, seeing that, by this means, we are shewn the vast extent of that change which Christianity effected in this instance. It is reckoned a triumph of the gospel when a man of the ordinary stamp, whose passions have carried him far from the path of virtue, is brought back thereto and reformed. But should it be thought a less triumph of the same heavenly energy, when the most intense of all the impulses to which human nature is liable—the ambition of a master spirit, yields it-

self—gives in, and learns to submit itself to motives of a higher order? In the instance of Chalmers, this substitution of the sense of duty, as a Christian, and as a minister, and this dislodgement of the ambition and the self-seeking of the man, presents itself as, perhaps, the centre-lesson which these four volumes convey to the heart of the seriously-minded reader. This subordination of the man, and this supremacy of a motive more pure, was a revolution which (as we may well suppose) went on through many years, bringing itself gradually to its culminating point. But effectively and substantially, the change occupied a very brief transition period. The conflict between the man and the Christian was brought to a crisis, within a few months, or even weeks.

Considerations of a general kind, such as a solemn conviction of the comparative worthlessness of the best things of earth, when placed in comparison with the things that are unseen and eternal, meet us in the Journal very often.

“My confinement—wrote Mr. Chalmers, (this was in the February of 1809,) has fixed in my heart a very strong impression of the insignificance of time,—an impression which I trust will not abandon me, though I again reach the heyday of health and vigour. This should be the first step to another impression still more salutary—the magnitude of eternity. Strip human life of its connexion with a higher scene of existence, and it is the illusion of an instant, an unmeaning farce, a series of visions and projects, which terminate in nothing.”

Passages such as this may be called the commonplace of religious sentiment; for every seriously minded man has at times thus felt and spoken, especially on occasions of a similar kind, namely, when returning to life, as from the brink of the grave. The difference was, that, with Chalmers, feelings of this sort had an intensity of which ordinary minds can know nothing. But he passed on beyond this ground: he learned that to vanquish the mighty strugglings of nature within him, to bring personal ambition and the desire of distinction into the place proper to them, he needed the aid of principles that have more vitality. It was not as in a cell, with a skull poised between his fingers, and musing upon the brevity and vanity of life, that this man of commanding powers and of unrivalled gifts acquired an habitual feeling which could, with a profound sincerity, express itself in the often-cited words, “I count all things as dross for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord.” It was to this higher order of motives that he desired to yield himself.

“Not much satisfied with my performance,

but had a livelier glimpse this evening of the propitiation than I had before experienced; and the peace and confidence and delight in prayer which I felt while under it, convinces me that this is the object which I must ever strive after and maintain. Give me, O God, 'to hold fast my confidence and the rejoicing of my hope firm unto the end.'

"*Sunday, December 8th.*—Let all vanity, O my God, be crucified within me. Let my sole aim be to win souls; and though I cannot at all times command a clear and enraptured view of Divine truth, let me fill up every interval with works which bespeak the Christian. Bring me closer and closer to Him to whom Thou hast given all power, and committed all judgment. Fill me with His fulness; and may I have peace and joy with Thee through Jesus Christ my Lord."—Vol. i. pp. 229, 230.

If Chalmers—the Christian man and minister, were to be held up as an example, one of many, of the working of Christian motives upon the natural dispositions, these citations must be regarded as edifying; yet not as extraordinary: the value attaching to them results from their bearing upon a public course so unusual as was his. The hinge of this great man's life, before his country and the world, was the subordination of the impulses of a gigantic spirit to motives of a purely Christian order. Ambition *alternating* with such motives might have consisted with a career splendid, and useful also—useful perhaps in a more than ordinary degree. But no such compromise of such impulses would have consisted with the course of the man who was to renovate the Christianity of his country.

"*Sunday, 24th.*—Rose about nine: went immediately to the composition of my sermon. Could not attend church in the forenoon: preached in the afternoon. Have reason to question myself seriously as to my spirit in regard to all public services. Do I seek the glory of God? Have I no secret longings after my own glory? Have I a greater desire to ascertain the good I have done to souls, or the good I may have done to my own reputation? Do I not feel the impression of the splendid auditory that comes to hear me? Let me set myself in good earnest to quell this humiliating affection. O my God, let me lie low, and know what it is to be divested of self.

"*25th.*—I have to record this day, that I am not mortified to the love of praise. . . . I do much fear, or rather I certainly know, that I feel a complacency in all this,—and what if it be not superior to the pleasure I should feel in having been the instrument of a saving and spiritual impression? This is so distinct a preference of my own glory to that of God, so obvious a preaching of self instead of the Saviour, so glaring a preference of the wisdom of words to the simplicity which is in the cross of Christ, that my carnal tendencies in regard to this matter should be the subject of my strictest vigilance and severest castigation."—Vol. iii. p. 91.

It would not be easy to find an instance—in truth, we do not recollect one, within the compass of modern times—comparable, on the whole, to that to which, for a moment, we are now intending to advert, if it be considered as a trial of a man's conquest over the idolatry of SELF. The initial stages of this mastery had been passed through in those critical weeks of early life during which Chalmers awoke to the consciousness of Christianity, such as throughout his after course he proclaimed it. The particular instance we have now in view, shews that that was not a spring-time fervour, quickly to subside, but that it was a firm life-long principle which had come in to rule his heart, and to give direction to his labours. In every sense it was the very choice of the three kingdoms—as to rank, station, official position, personal intelligence, notoriety, that had crowded itself into the spacious room where he delivered his "Lectures on Religious Establishments." An audience rather to be chosen than this, by an ambitious orator, could nowhere have been found. But the effect actually produced upon this cultured and this self-esteeming company, by the orator, far overwent all ordinary bounds of excitement: he carried with him all the mind and feeling that came within the sound of his voice: when he rose—all rose; and the acclamations of that aristocracy of the British empire came in, as a thunder, to shake the soul of the man who was thus taught to feel what his power was:—

"Nothing," says one who met him in private, after the delivery of his first Lecture, "nothing was more striking, amidst all this excitement, than the child-like humility of the great man himself. All the flattery seemed to produce no effect whatever upon him; his mind was entirely absorbed in his great object; and the same kind, playful, and truly Christian spirit, that so endeared him to us all, was everywhere apparent in his conduct."—Vol. iv. p. 40.

If one were to sit down, coldly, to analyze Chalmers's qualities, intellectual and moral, for the purpose of reporting thereupon, and of shewing from which of these elements his power over the minds of others resulted, or from which, chiefly, there might seem to remain a something not fully accounted for: it would be so—for this power (so irresistible wherever it is found) sprung not from this or that faculty, eminent in him; nor merely from the accumulation of such gifts; but rather from a condensation of all faculties—spirit, mind, heart, bodily energy, effected by the force of the one-master influence to which he had surrendered his being. Whenever this sort of concentration has

place, even in instances that stand at an immeasurable distance below the one before us, as to mind and accomplishment, yet the same power over other spirits shows itself in its degree. The moment when the tones of a voice, (never to be mistaken when once they had been heard,) and which are proper to this species of influence, fall upon the ear, we all—great and small, or how highly so ever we may rate our individual superiority to the speaker, we all fall before it:—we surrender at discretion, for the hour, at least: such is a law of the world of mind; and such is also a law in the “kingdom of grace.” But when, as in the instance of Chalmers, forces of the rarest kind came to be thus concentrated, the effect was in the properest sense of the word—irresistible. One might, perhaps—if well-cased in the coldest suit of analytic severity, have stood out against the orator, if listened to as an orator merely; but not against this “man of God,” whose many splendid gifts were used by him, as tools only, and used with a lavish disregard—a high contempt of all things, except the making full proof of his ministry, “and the finishing of the work which had been given him, by the Lord,” to do it.

It would not be a very difficult (although an invidious) task, to take in hand the several articles of this great man’s intellectual furniture, and to show, that, in each, he has had his equals, or his superiors. Be it so; nor does he stand alone, far from it—looking only to recent times, as an example of Christian devotedness and simplicity. But we think he does stand quite alone—we do not recollect an instance fairly comparable to this, of natural gifts so remarkable, we may say—so splendid, that have been in any such manner concentrated, and brought to bear upon the highest purposes, with so absolute a subordination and exclusion of inferior and disturbing motives. On this ground, we should be content to rest our challenge, in behalf of Chalmers, of a foremost place among the noted, and the best men of modern times.

It could be of no sort of avail—even if any who knew the man better than we did, were inclined so to act, to bring against us, while we make this challenge, some exceptive instances, with the whispered cautionary saw—“the best of men, are but men at the best:” and—“I could tell you—so and so.” We do not doubt you could, but we do not want to hear it. We know already all that your string of pretty anecdotes could teach us; we know that Chalmers was not a seeraph; but a man: we know that the mastery he had acquired over inferior motives

and over personal ambition, must have cost such a man mighty struggles;—and, therefore, that there must have been moments when Satan (the great detractor, or when petty detractors) might have caught him at a disadvantage. So it *may* have been: so it *must* have been; and therefore it is that his example is of that kind which so well breathes holy purposes into young bosoms: we know of this Elijah, that he “was a man of like passions with ourselves.”

We give this prominence to this characteristic of Chalmers’s oratory, because we think it, in fact, the secret of his power, not as a pulpit orator merely, but in every aspect in which he has a claim to be spoken of, as a public man. It was this same concentration of his faculties, and this subordination of all to the higher purposes of his life, which made him what he was—not only as a PREACHER and WRITER; but as the RESTORER of evangelic doctrine and evangelic feeling in Scotland;—as the ECONOMIST, and municipal Reformer; and as the LEADER of the great Ecclesiastical movements of his times. In each of these principal aspects, it is our purpose (with all brevity) to regard him.

Not because he was not a most effective pulpit orator, and a powerful writer, should we hold his merits in these respects in a secondary place; but because what he was, either as Preacher or Writer, comes most naturally into its fit place of *Instrumentality*, in relation to the substantial purposes: to which Dr. Chalmers devoted his powers, both as a speaker and a writer. From his public appearances in the pulpit, or through the press, deduct the whole of that massive force which sprang from the sense he had of the importance of the object before him, and what remains would not have been enough to fill out a tenth of that space which, through life, he occupied in the esteem, the admiration, and the reverential regard of his contemporaries. An Orator truly, and a Writer too, but immeasurably more was he to his country, and to the world, than either.

In speaking of Dr. Chalmers as the main mover of a revived evangelic feeling in Scotland, it is (we should think) superfluous for us to protest against the putting an invidious interpretation upon what we may advance, as if we were either unconscious of the part that had been nobly and well sustained by others, or were too slenderly informed as to facts relating to the antecedent period, or were inclined to disparage what was good and admirable, already existing. If anything that follows should seem to bear

a meaning of this sort, we beg the reader to understand us otherwise. Nor let it be too readily imagined that a feeling more allied to things south of the Tweed, than to things north of it, throws a prejudicial shade over the latter in our view.

As to the *relative* religious condition of England and Scotland at the time when he entered upon his course as an evangelic preacher, it is decisively expressed in several passages of these Memoirs. His journeys southward, and the intimacies he formed among the religiously-minded upper classes of the Established Church, produced a decisive impression upon his mind, and sent him back to Scotland such as probably he would never have been if he had not crossed the Tweed, or had made himself extensively familiar with *English* evangelical writers. We refer below to passages which need not be cited, but which afford quite enough support to what is here affirmed.*

All counterpoising instances allowed for to the utmost extent that can be thought reasonable, it must yet be stated as a broad fact, that the evangelic revival of the last century, which took its rise in the Methodist movement, had affected England more widely, more deeply, and in a more auspicious manner than it had affected Scotland. The question is not, whether Whitefield's preaching or Wesley's had met with as much immediate acceptance as it might and should in Scotland; but the impulse did not, in the same degree or manner, convey itself to the religious masses; nor, in any such way as in England, did it call up a body of ministers influenced by the same spirit, and attached to the same principles. Little might there be to choose between the lip-orthodoxy of the English Church of that time, and the semi-infidelity or the *moderation* of the Scotch; for the one was a mere "form of godliness," and so was the other; if there be an intrinsic difference between the two that is worth the pains of hunting for, let it be hunted for. But herein an extrinsic difference may be noted; that while the one was, in many instances, giving way before a genial life-stirring influence, the other offered a fixed resistance to any such influences: in

the one country—England—the existing formalism had become little more than a breathless representative of what had once lived; but the other sat in its place of authority, eyeing with jealousy any signs of life about it.

The mind of Scotland, decisively intellectual and logical as it is, and the close contact of many of its clergy with the fathers of the infidelity of the age, gave to that shadow of Christianity which they professionally respected more of coherence and more of philosophic completeness than was ever thought of or cared for among the chubby, rosy, portly, beneficed-ones—the sleek lookers-out for stalls, deaneries, and mitres, of the English Church. DEMAS loses his own soul; but then he stands less in the way of the progress of the Gospel than do the sallow-visaged gownsmen of Mars Hill. These, while they mock at Paul's sermon, reason too, and they make good their ground. Demas betakes himself to what he so well loves, and is silent; but the anti-Christianity of Scotland, and its non-Christianity, was not mere worldliness—it was a distinctly pronounced scheme, framed for the express purpose of shutting out the Gospel. Yet this is not all; and should not an entire candour lead us to acknowledge something more in behalf of the *moderate* party, of that time?

The men—many of them highly accomplished, as they were, and distinguished too by their genius and intelligence, who headed the non-evangelic feeling of the last century, in Scotland—the intimates of Hume and Adam Smith, when they recoiled from what we regard as First Principles in Christianity, thought of those principles only as they were embodied and enunciated in those forms with which themselves were proximately connected. Among those bright spirits, how many of them could be named who had ever given themselves the pains to inquire what it was which the Apostles had taught? Very, very few. That which they *did* think of, that concerning which they had any sufficient information, or any definite idea, was (not the Greek of the Apostolic Epistles and Gospels, but) the "Westminster Confession." It has been customary with candid Protestant writers to offer a word—not exactly of apology or of vindication—but a word of extenuation, in behalf of the French Encyclopædists. True; we say, they *ought* to have informed themselves better concerning the Christianity which they rejected with so much scorn; they did not do so—they thought it enough that they knew something of the "Church." If they blasphemed CHRIST, it was because they

* Dr. Chalmers refers in terms of high approval, and as having much affected his own views and feelings, to the following among other *English* evangelical writings:—"Wilberforce's Practical View," vol. i. pp. 184-186; "Baxter's Body of Practical Divinity," p. 213; "Life of Henry," p. 217; "Foster's Essays," p. 226; "Hannah More," pp. 210, 211; "Romaine's Life of Faith," vol. ii. p. 455, vol. iii. p. 87. He experienced similar benefits from the acquaintance he had formed with several eminent Christian men in England. See vol. i. p. 335, vol. ii. pp. 360, 363, 364, vol. iii. p. 395.

thought of the Church as His appointed interpreter, and that Church they had reason enough to condemn.

Assuredly, we are not intending, in this unfit place, to moot the "Westminster Confession." Uncalled for, and unproductive of any good, would be the introduction of a theme so vast in its compass, and so various in its bearings. Yet, while leaving this great subject untouched, does not bare justice demand so much as this to be said, that what the non-evangelical ministry and laity of Scotland of the last century recoiled from—what they disbelieved and endeavoured to ignore, was not the Christianity of the Apostolic Scriptures, but the definitions and the specialities of the "Confession?" In the view of these thoughtful men, there stood, on their left hand, the specious sophisms propounded by their accomplished infidel associates; together with all those bordering negations among which a man may, all his life, go in and out, and may continue to hide from others, and from a congregation, and indeed from himself, what it is which he does really believe, or how much he has ceased to believe. Among these negations he may at least evade the pursuit of those who would hunt him down with inconvenient questions as to his creed. On their right hand there stood—not the indulgent brevities of "Thirty-Nine Articles," only a few of which need to have troubled them; but those "Thirty-three Chapters," in which definitiveness does its utmost, not merely to exclude differences of opinion, but to render doctrinal individuality an impossibility;—if not to brand it as a crime! We ask then—does not bare justice demand that this state of the case should not be overlooked, when the facts are before us of the non-evangelical, and almost anti-Christian condition of a large portion of the Scottish ministry, in times gone by? As to that form of fervid piety which still survived at many points in Scotland, and which brightly illuminated many a private home, and more than a few manse, throughout the country, it had, (without a noticeable exception,) taken to itself an iron-bound conformity, in contour and in substance, to the same doctrinal standard. "Mighty in the Scriptures" were many of the silvery-crowned patriarchs of that time. But could you, among a hundred such men, have found so many as three whose blood would not have curdled at hearing the most modest suggestion of a difference between St. Paul and the "Confession?" We would not overstate the matter; and would most readily listen to counter-averments; yet must not so much as this be granted—that the philosophic, non-believing body of

ministers, in the Scottish church, were presented with nothing, as the alternative of their own cold negations, but the most inexorable of those interpretations of Christianity under which the Reformation had uttered its mind?

Justice, at least, if not honour, let it be rendered to the departed! As to that revival of evangelic doctrine in bringing about which Chalmers had so much to do, it did not cast away the "Confession:" far from it: but as one might say—it uplifted it, bodily, from off the national mind and heart. During the powerful heavings of this modern revival, the "Westminster Confession," like an incrustment, has been fairly borne aloft—still an undoubted object of homage, even as heretofore, and yet so carried up from its bearings as to give free access to the light and breath of heaven—vastly for the comfort and health of the dwellers in the house!

The mission of Chalmers, for which the peculiar structure of his mind so well fitted him, was—not that of a dogmatic reformer, who passes the creed of a nation through the refining fires of his own mind, and who issues it anew, bearing upon it his likeness: his mission was one of a far more fruitful sort; for it was to bring back the soul of his countrymen to the vitality of those doctrines which the nation had always *professed* to believe. For fulfilling *this* ministry there could be no necessity to extract from Scripture any one new article of belief:—there appeared no urgent necessity even for bringing the existing belief under a process of critical revision. All that could be required, as a point of discretion, was, to leave in the shade those matters which men's instincts prompt them there to leave. With apostolic power did Chalmers force upon the mind of the Scottish people the principal elements of "the Faith once delivered to the Saints." The people, and their ministers, met and accepted this call to return to the ground which they had, in feeling at least, abandoned. Had he taken the other course—by mistaking his qualifications—namely, that of forging anew a THEOLOGY, the issue would have been—tens of thousands of reams of printed paper, defending, expounding, and impugning, this dogmatic recension of Christian principles. There would have been no end of the war of words, and in how small a degree would such a contention have been compensated by the solid fruits of the Christian life!

Much to be noticed is the easy acquiescent manner in which Chalmers passed into the heart of evangelic doctrine—just such as he found it. He did not forge himself into

it; he walked into it. He did not fight his way; but found it open. Without throwing too much stress upon the distinctive import of the two words, we might say that the POWERS of the gospel came upon him, rather than its FORCE vanquished him. So far as such a comparison might be instituted, Thomas Scott yielded slowly, and with a struggle at each step, to the "Force of truth." Chalmers gave himself up, willingly, and joyfully, and at once, to its power. Thus it was that while the one was fitted for his office as a Biblical champion, who, through the Press, was to instruct and guide thousands of his countrymen, and was to lead and inform their teachers;—the other, through the Press and Pulpit, (but the Press as a reflection from the Pulpit,) was to stir the soul, and wake up the heart of the nation—a nation needing to be thus moved, far more than to be merely informed; while in England, instruction more than movement, was the urgent want. On one ground of comparison, the two men—so unlike in almost every sense, as to intellect and temper, were of the same mould; for to both belonged that robust mental conformation, and that firm, or, we might say, stern moral tone, which held them far—fixedly remote—from all those laxities of doctrine or of devotional sentiment, which, in too many instances, have given a colour of reason to the reproaches of those who are always assailing evangelic teaching, and who affirm that it genders, or excuses, licentious practice. The entire tenor of the writings and preachings of these two eminent men—both of them *pronounced* Calvinists, convincingly proved that a sensitive jealousy for the honour of Christian morals comports well with *that* doctrinal system; and that, for the sake of morality, it can never be necessary to Arminianize with Wesley.

In relation to this mission, as the mover of evangelic feeling among his countrymen, it should be said that Chalmers's mind was cumulative more than analytic; powerful, more than severe; rich, more than exact; abundant, more than selective. That his intellect had more of breadth, than of acuteness; more of grasp, than of delicacy of hold; that it was excursive more than incisive or penetrating; and therefore, that he was one whose part it would be boldly and effectively to maintain the position upon which he had, at first, established himself; not to push enterprises upon untried ground. Master he was of his own; and most happy in the use and enjoyment of his possessions, as a Christian man, as a teacher, and as a theologian; nor was he easily to be tempted to risk any portion of these, the goods

of his spiritual existence, upon a "speculation," in the regions of divine philosophy. He knew perhaps little of those recurrent disquietudes that beset more tranquil and more meditative spirits. The TRUTH was with him a vivid consciousness, to which his whole soul and understanding responded; and he would give ear in patience, or in courtesy, rather than with curiosity, to any who might quietly approach him with "new views," or with professions of a "further insight" into the meaning of Scripture.

Such, as we think, was the man, as to his mental structure—to say nothing now of his extraordinary powers as an orator—who was sent into the vineyard to proclaim anew the "Mystery of Godliness," and to call away the people, not merely from formality, from infidelity, from worldly-mindedness, but especially, and in a more peculiar sense, from the dialectic distinction-making, and the system-making "Divinity" which so easily comes in the place of, and destroys, a cordial communion with the SUBSTANCE of Christian belief and practice.

For any who (like ourselves) must derive their idea of Dr. Chalmers's *ordinary* pulpit style, solely from his published writings, it may be fair, and indeed sufficient, to take the volumes containing his "Lectures on the Epistle to the Romans," as the ground of the opinion we should form on that subject; and to regard them as true samples of the quality and tendency of his preaching, when he is thought of, not as the great preacher, called out on peculiar occasions to display his powers, and to prove himself the idol of audiences; but as the pastor and teacher who, whether in his own parish church or elsewhere, or through the press, laboured to awaken the ear of Scotland (well-taught already) to that message of God to man, which emphatically is—the GOSPEL. By no attempt at ingenious or erudite elucidation are these Lectures recommended: the intention so to treat that portion of Scripture is disclaimed in the Preface; nor do they stimulate a prurient religious curiosity, by the promise or the insinuation of any novelties of "view," in rendering the substance of Christian doctrine into the mind of the modern Church. The preacher is *not* saying, from page to page, "the Church has misapprehended such and such vital matters *hitherto*;" and now I am come to set things right:—"what he *does* say is, in substance, this—these things we *do* believe, as did our fathers; now therefore let us see to it that this faith comes home to our souls, and that it works within us as it should.

A better criticism upon these Lectures—

better inasmuch as it represents, in the most genuine manner, the effect they are adapted to produce, we should not ourselves easily put into words than the one which, at the moment, has been given us by a reader precisely of the class to which the preacher would have been most pleased to address himself; it is to this effect,—“These Lectures are full of that eloquence which flows without effort from a great and *rich* mind—itsself full of the Gospel, and which makes its way at once to a soul loving the Gospel. In reading these Lectures my feeling has been that of wonder that there *can* be infidelity in a world before which *such* an exhibition of the Christian system has been made.”

It was thus that, taking up the conspicuous grandeur of the Christian dispensation, and its fitness to move the conscience, and to appease it, Chalmers, affecting to add nothing to the wealth he administered, but labouring only to administer it without abatement, made proof of the divine axiom, “him that honoureth Me I will honour.” So *was* he honoured as the instrument (no disparagement to others) of effecting a revival of evangelic feeling in Scotland, which was not merely of the widest extent, at the time, but which promises to be the more permanent, because, although all men know, nor will they ever forget, who, mainly, was the instrument employed to bring it about, it did not take to itself any of those specialities of the individual mind which serve to attach a *name* to a new utterance of Christianity. Happy, most happy was Chalmers in this respect, that, while he has left a name which Scotland will never cease to pronounce with love and veneration, he has held it off from that proclamation of the Gospel which himself made. No such egotism, or semblance of egotism, could he have endured as that which in certain noted instances, has fixed upon a religious community a designation—a *name*, boding its doom, as proclaiming its origin, its quality, and, too much, its feeling.

That those of Chalmers's writings in which he shines as the orator will live, we should not question; but yet should confidently predict, if not a longer, a wider, and a more potential immortality to those of his works—as these Lectures—in perusing which the reader loses all recollection of the *preacher* and of the author, and is absorbed—mind and soul—in the subject which concerns his own highest welfare, his own immortality. As to the one class of these writings, if the reader of taste often admires and is delighted, he sometimes is tempted to pause and to halt, and to exercise the discriminative and

critical faculty. But as to the other class, although the same peculiarities of style, or, as we say, the same *mannerisms*, do present themselves (frequently in some places) the reader ceases to notice them, for he feels that the preacher is labouring with incessant, reiterated, and even importunate assiduity, to promote his spiritual advantage, to dispel every dangerous illusion, to open up every concealed spring of evil, and, most of all, to invite and provoke his cordial acceptance of the free grace of God toward him. Then, along with this urgent incitation, there is a grave intensity of language, in every instance, in which, in the course of exposition, he is led to insist upon the practical influences of a Christian faith. The bold outline, the fresh and vivid colours, the depth of the shadows, the brightness of the lights, everything in these expositions, has the aspect of a near reality: the reader, whether he accepts or rejects, as for himself, that which the preacher propounds to him, does not find himself able to resist this one feeling, that truths the most momentous are before him.

Far beyond the boundaries of the Church which Dr. Chalmers and his associates led off from the Establishment, has gone his influence in restoring a genuine Christian feeling; for long before the Disruption he had stood in a prominent position in this character; nor can it be doubted, that what has been termed—we do not ask with what appropriateness, the “Residuary Church,” has received, to a large amount, the very highest benefits from his personal ministry; or that it is now receiving much of the same, through the medium of his writings. Besides, he had already, and extensively, moulded the young mind of Scotland while discharging his duties as Professor; first, of moral philosophy (at St. Andrews), and then of theology (at Edinburgh).

At this point it becomes necessary to bring forward, and to insist upon, a distinction for which there may, indeed, often be room, in reference to public men; but in few instances is it so conspicuously necessary as in the one before us. This distinction is, that by means of which, we set off, the one from the other—the influence which a man of high quality personally possesses, and exerts over all near him, and upon the public mind at large;—and then, the position he occupies in the world of religious opinion, or philosophy, as the originator, or advocate, of this or that scheme of dogmas—whether theological, ethical, metaphysical, or political. Only three or four men among those known to history, could be named, whose PERSONAL INFLUENCE—apart from the doc-

trine they maintained, might seem to have surpassed that which Chalmers exercised—over popular assemblies—over the soul and reason of the youth who crowded his classrooms, or generally, over society—Scottish and English, wherever he was seen and listened to. As to that irresistible power which a spirit of this order, indeed one of the “mighty,” exerts within its circle, it may be said, that he “carried all before him;” or all in whose souls there was just enough of the rudiment of the same greatness to afford a ground of communion. Himself burning with intensity of devotion to the object in view, at any one time—an intensity in the midst of which every thought of self was utterly consumed, he bore with him every mind that might be capable of a similar oblivion, and that was natively sensitive toward the great, the vast, the good, the beautiful. Let there be only a smouldering spark of the INFINITE in any man’s bosom, only a yearning toward the TRUE, and then Chalmers held that man as his own: in the hearing of his voice that spark flamed up! that fire glowed! and, as he went on, the yearning—never so feeble at the first, quickened into a fervent desire; soon it was an anguish, and the man came to the resolve (whether or not maintained) to sell all that he had, so that he might only possess the pearl of great price—even immortal truth!

Yes, but Chalmers *did* fail sometimes as to this, his own power over human souls; he failed when there was before him the man over whose frosty-clear view of his own selfish ends, no cloud of generous emotion ever passes: he failed when he had to do with the interested, with the frivolously egotistical, with the factitious, as well as with the false: in one word, his personal influence was at zero in respect of all between whom, and himself, there was quite wanting that which, with him, was the foremost quality of his nature—the bold—involuntary—seraph-like oblivion, of small, sinister, and self-seeking impulses.

This personal influence Chalmers possessed, and used, as an orator on special occasions; as a preacher of the gospel; as a Professor, and academic teacher, and as a man in society. Few could step forward as his rivals on this ground. Luther might, and so, although so wholly dissimilar as men, might Wesley. We could not allow any one to come into such a competition who, great as might be his influence during his hour or two, when on his legs, in the senate, at the bar, on the hustings, or in the pulpit, dropped out of that place of power the moment when he walked away from his

proper stage. When Chalmers was led away from his place in front of enraptured audiences, and carried to his home to repose among the hearts of a few, he became, indeed, in his unbendings, “one *among us*,” but never was he a man less than himself, or small as “ourselves.” Never, (so we think, and we do not wish to be contradicted,) never did Chalmers fall into the posture of the god which the worshipper himself contemns, as only a block, the next hour after he has burned pounds of incense at its shrine. Never, as we think, or very rarely, did he lose his grasp of some great purpose—religious or political, and, therefore, seldom or never did he appear in the eyes of those around him, other than an object of reverential regard.

But now when thus the personal influence of the man has been thought of, and set down at its value, a question presents itself involving considerations of a wholly different kind. The place that should be assigned to Dr. Chalmers in the several spheres in which he took a position, cannot be determined in any other mode than by instituting an inquiry which must be irrespective of all personal feelings, and must be pursued on grounds not at all, or very remotely related one to the other. He, in his writings, occupies a place in the departments of theology—moral philosophy, and intellectual science, of ecclesiastical polity, of political economy, and of that science which has not yet, authentically, received its designation, but which embraces whatever bears upon the social, domestic, and individual wellbeing of the masses of the people in a civilized and industrial community.

In each of these respects Dr. Chalmers may rightfully claim a standing of note, in some of them a place of high note; but as to each, or within each of these spheres, he has his competitors, and, perhaps, his superiors. Now, if any attempt were made to indicate what might be the relative value of his contributions to these above named sciences, it must proceed upon the ground of a carefully conducted analysis of his writings. Manifestly, *no such* process, *no such* analysis, could there be room for within the compass of an article which is professedly devoted to the Memoir at this time before us. And yet, undoubtedly, it is to be desired that some such distributive analysis of writings so voluminous and important, should be undertaken. But, whether the greatness, the variety, and the difficulty of the task, should discourage any one from attempting it, we cannot say; and yet think that, if undertaken and performed modestly and assiduously, and with a feeling at once of independence

and of respectful and affectionate regard to the memory of so great a man, a criticism of this kind could scarcely fail to be in some manner serviceable to readers of the Works, and that it would involve small risk of damage to a reputation such as that of Dr. Chalmers. Thus thinking, we propose, therefore, in a future Number of this Review, and at some length, to enter upon the ground we have named; and in making this announcement we feel the more free to return to our immediate purpose. Apart from such an intention here professed, it would have seemed proper or indispensable at this point to advance an opinion, more or less amply expressed, as to the characteristics of that system of doctrines which Dr. Chalmers maintained and promulgated from his chair, first at St. Andrews and afterwards at Edinburgh.

THE PROFESSORIAL CHAIR was, in truth, Dr. Chalmers's best loved position as a public man. It was this which he had most desired; and when it came in sight, he stepped forward to it with the most thorough satisfaction: it was for the sake of this that he relinquished tempting emoluments—tempting to men of ordinary mould.

"The ministerial charge of the West Church in Greenock having recently become vacant, the patron, Sir Michael Shaw Stewart, requested Dr. Chalmers to accept of that living; a generous and unsolicited offer, which was thus gratefully declined:—

"*Edinburgh, 27th December, 1839.*

"TO SIR MICHAEL SHAW STEWART.

"DEAR SIR MICHAEL,—I deeply feel the whole force of the compliment you have done me in offering to my acceptance the most lucrative ecclesiastical living in Scotland, and whose endowments, I believe, are nearly double those of the one which I now occupy. You may well believe that nothing could induce me to decline the honour and the advantage of such a proposal but a firm conviction of the superior importance of a Theological Chair to any Church whatever, along with the rooted preference which I have ever felt for the Professorial over the ministerial life.

"My personal gratitude to yourself for this truly handsome proposition is in every way as strong and as heartfelt as if I had acceded to it. You have in fact conferred upon me a substantial favour by having placed within my reach a benefice so lucrative. You have enabled me to say, in language which cannot be mistaken, in what estimation I hold the Professorships of Theology throughout Scotland; and in pleading, whether for the virtuous patronage or for the adequate endowment of these high offices, your offer of the parish of Greenock will effectually shield me from any ungenerous imputation to which I might otherwise have been exposed.

"Permit me to state the cordial satisfaction I

feel in the deep sense which you express of the deep responsibility that attaches to the exercise of the Church patronage wherewith Providence hath invested you; and with my most earnest prayers both for your public usefulness and for your highest personal interests, I have the honour to be, dear Sir Michael, your most obliged and most obedient servant,—THOMAS CHALMERS."—Vol. iii. pp. 310, 311.

This decisive preference of the Professor's Chair to the pulpit carries with it much meaning, as indicative of Dr. Chalmers's intellectual and moral conformation; and the more so when it is recollected that the man who thus loved and chose the classroom had always at his command crowded and overcrowded churches. It would have been no wonder if a preacher, so much followed and flattered, had found for himself a plea of "usefulness" sufficient to overbear any reasons which would have confined him to the less exciting duties, and to the drudgery of the teacher's office. As subsidiary motives, tending to confirm him in this preference, we should be safe in naming that opinion of the value of "popularity" which had settled itself upon his feelings, as well as fixed itself in his understanding. A contemptuous feeling it was not; for his nature was too generous, and his humanity too deep and broad, to admit of a sentiment the harbouring of which implies coldness of heart and pride. He would and did scorn *baseness*, but it was not in him to scorn the mere folly, levity, and waywardness, that rush in to lay their contributions at the feet of a popular preacher. He did not haughtily set his foot upon these offerings, but he gladly escaped from the place where they were wont to be heaped upon him. This class of worshippers have only themselves to thank if they sometimes drive into retirement one whom they would gladly have retained; give them an *idol*, a puppet, and the thing will stay with them until they are tired of it, and call for another; but if, as happens once in three centuries, it is a MAN they have to do with, it is likely that he will get himself away from them as quickly as he may. Chalmers's instinctive sagacity and his keen perception of human nature, together with his high moral tone, and the constitutional impatience of his temper, altogether operated to abate very much the pleasurable emotions attendant upon popularity; the disgust nearly balanced the gratification.

There was yet another class of considerations that went to the side of the Professor's duties, as compared with those of the Preacher and Pastor. The unwearied energy of his nature, his lofty conceptions of the

ministerial office, the practical turn of his mind in whatever related to social interests, his talent for organization, and, as the "bond of perfectness," around all these forces—the depth and animation of his benevolence, combined to bring with them such a sense of what should be done, or attempted by a parish minister, that, when he set himself to do it, the mighty task well-nigh crushed him: a giant's strength broke down beneath the load of an archangel's labours. It was with feelings of prostration that he left Glasgow, on his way to St. Andrews. We should, perhaps say, that a mingled consciousness of the collapse of his physical and mental powers was that which drove him from his field of pastoral labour:—

"I should like to unite the labour of preparation for the pulpit with the labour of household ministrations in the parish; this is a union which I have made many attempts to realize, and I now find myself to be altogether unequal to it: this mortifying experience has grown upon me for a good many months, but never did it become so distinct and decisive until the present winter. My very last attempt at exertion out of doors has been followed up by several weeks of utter incapacity for fixed thought. I find it impossible any longer to acquit myself both of the personal and mental fatigues of my present office."—Vol. ii. p. 374.

That no feeling of personal mortification, as if he had slenderly or with little fruit, discharged his high functions as a parish minister, mixed itself with the reasons that led him from Glasgow to St. Andrews, is quite certain. Dr. Hanna, in a very effective passage, sums up the product of his ministrations there; and it is a sort of justice, even to the biographer, to cite this testimony, in this place—every count of which we believe to be strictly conformable to truth:—

"When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow, by the great body of the upper classes of society evangelical doctrines were nauseated and despised: when he left it, even by those who did not bow to their influence, these doctrines were acknowledged to be, indeed, the very doctrines of the Bible. When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow, in the eye of the multitude evangelism stood confounded with a drivelling sanctimoniousness, or a sour-minded asceticism: when he left it, from all such false associations the Christianity of the New Testament stood clearly and nobly redeemed. When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow, for nearly a century the Magistracy and Town-Council had exercised the city patronage in a spirit determinedly anti-evangelical: when he left it, so complete was the revolution which had been effected, that from that time forward none but evangelical clergymen were appointed by the city patrons. When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow,

there and elsewhere over Scotland, were many most devoted clergymen of the Establishment who had given themselves up wholly to the ministry of the word and to prayer, but there was not one in whose faith and practice week-day ministrations had the place or power which he assigned to them: when he left it he had exhibited such a model of fidelity, diligence, and activity, in all departments of ministerial labour, as told finely upon the spirit and practice of the whole ministry of Scotland. When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow, unnoticed thousands of the city population were sinking into ignorance, infidelity, and vice, and his eye was the first, in this country, to foresee to what a fearful magnitude that evil, if suffered to go on unchecked, would rise: when he left it, his ministry in that city remained behind him a permanent warning to a nation which has been but slow to learn that the greatest of all questions, both for statesmen and for churchmen, is the condition of those untaught and degraded thousands who swarm around the base of the social edifice, and whose brawny arms may yet grasp its pillars to shake or destroy. When Dr. Chalmers came to Glasgow, in the literary circles of the Scottish metropolis a thinly disguised infidelity sat on the seats of greatest influence, and smiled or scoffed at a vital, energetic faith in the great and distinctive truths of revelation, while, widely over his native land the spirit of a frigid indifference to religion prevailed: when he left it, the current of public sentiment had begun to set in a contrary direction, and although it took many years, and the labour of many other hands to carry that healthful change onward to maturity, yet, I believe, that it is not over-estimating it to say, that it was mainly by Dr. Chalmers's ministry, in Glasgow—by his efforts, at this period, in the pulpit and through the press—that the tide of national opinion and sentiment was turned."—Vol. ii. pp. 483-485.

It was from a field thus tilled by himself—a field so extensive, and with a sense of responsibility most vivid, that he turned away to place himself in the Professor's Chair. We do not think that the foremost motives, in this instance, were those which sprung from his conscious need of repose—bodily and mental; nor, if we might say it, without risk of being misunderstood, do we think that the one motive named by himself, as determinative of his preference, was in fact, the impulse (though he thought it to be so) that carried him from the one sphere of labour to the other. He said, and he fully believed it, that he would rather spend himself as a Professor, than as a Pastor, because, while discharging the one function, his influence would touch a single congregation only; but in the other case it would immediately be spread over a hundred. This was a good reason for such a preference, and an obvious one too; but, we think, a far deeper instinct of the intellectual nature was that which worked within him, though he knew it not.

Instincts have relation always to the functions which the being is destined to discharge; and this is true of man in his highest developments, as well as of the insect tribes. Minds of the very first class—of which Bacon and Newton may stand as the fittest samples—are swayed by an instinct of a less determinate sort than that which so irresistibly takes its course with others. These first class men know, with a tranquil assurance, that, in due time, they shall enter upon their kingdom, and shall rule the mind of the species through ages that are future. *Their* function is to carry the mind of the species forward on to new ground; and this is a function which no turbulent or very vivid emotions must disturb. Minds of the class next below these, whose mission in the world is to take up the body of admitted and accepted truth, and to shed it (as one might say) fraught with a new energy into other minds, these are urged forward by an impulse than which none within the compass of our nature is more potent, or is more irrepressible. “Nature,” as we are used rapidly to say, “does nothing in vain.” When she launches into the world a MIND that can carry, and sway, and ingenerate other minds, she binds in the bundle of its faculties a faculty, a force, an impulse, of undying elasticity, which carries that mind onward towards its field, its sphere; bringing it, as by an un-failing guidance, into the midst of the minds upon which it is to work. When this one potential intelligence does find itself at the very core of a cluster of minds, then, and not till then, it feels itself at home: then the destined faculties, the destined function, and the destined sphere of action, are all brought into productive juxta-position. The one mind has reached its centre of stable equipoise, and the man says,—“Now I am where I would be; nor would I change places with a king.” No; why should he? for himself is a sovereign; the Chair, which is a “chair” only to a professor of ordinary stamp, is, to such a man, truly a throne.

But why should not a mind like that of Chalmers content itself with, or prefer, a congregation, offering to his eye, as it does, twenty times the number of faces every week? Plainly this will not be to him what he is in quest of—his own sphere. The assemblage in church is far too promiscuous, and it comprises a large admixture of what is worthless in relation to the main purpose of the governing mind: it has none of that unity of intention which belongs to the select congregation of the class-room, every individual of which is, or seems to be, resolutely fixed upon the definite purpose which all are pursuing. A governing mind,

like that of Chalmers, must have under its hand masculine intellects, capable of following on an arduous path; young intellects, too, susceptible of, and yielding to, the plastic hand; and intellects already determined to a high object; and these must come under the moulding influence daily.

Then, as the means of greatly enhancing his influence over the minds and souls of young men, Dr. Chalmers entered the class-room, already invested with a reputation of the highest sort, acquired in the pulpit and through the press. He had won a bright fame, more extensive than the British islands, and he came among these young men, dedicating to their service powers which, at all times, could secure to him splendid audiences, and, if he had chosen, large emoluments. Among those men of mark who have distinguished themselves in Universities, as public teachers, very few have brought with them so large an amount of wealth acquired in other fields—that is to say, the wealth of a great reputation—as did Chalmers. And when he appeared before his students he came with his mind and heart entire. His step, as he advanced, was the steady tread of a man who comes, body and soul, to discharge his office. It was not that of one who, at the call of the college-clock, has dragged himself reluctant from the more favoured occupations of his study, and who, when the grudging hour has been given to his class, turns upon his heel, well pleased to go, and conscious that his stay is undesired by those whom he leaves.

And as there was no perfunctory listlessness in the class-room where Chalmers met his students, so neither did he labour under the disadvantage which attaches to the professorial function in the English Universities. In fact, to no *such* disparagements would it have been possible for *him* to have submitted. At Oxford and Cambridge the system of private tuition—the “coaching”—prodigal as it is of the life-power of so many accomplished men—the teachers, and costly, in a pecuniary sense, as it is to the learner, is nevertheless found to have an efficiency, as compared with class or professorial teaching, which probably will always secure for it the preference; or, at least, will do so until changes the most extensive shall have been introduced into the methods of training that are pursued in the same places. But, it need not be said, there can never be two paramount systems, taking effect within the same circle. At Oxford and Cambridge the working men—the men who are intent upon taking the highest honours to which they can aspire—the men who draw upon themselves the expectant eyes of their

peers, and the quiet approval of their superiors—these men perfectly well know that their chance of success is affected scarcely in any degree by what they do, or what they may listen to, in the lecture-room, with the professor, (and *he* knows this to be the fact too,) but that all must turn upon the use they can make of that hour of earnest attention which they pass daily with their tutor alone. Given, in any two instances, an equal amount of natural capacity and of previous acquirement, then the question, as to the success of either of the two, is—“Who is his coach?” This known, the result might be predicted with little risk of error.

The Professor, let him be what he may—able and zealous too—must be content to regard the function he discharges as formal merely or chiefly. He well knows, as to every hard-reading and aspiring man who frequents the lecture-room, that every moment spent there is, and must be, intently grudged, as so much time deducted from his available hours of labour. One cannot even fancy Dr. Chalmers filling a professor's chair under any such conditions as these. An empty honour would he have deemed the very highest appointment at Oxford or at Cambridge, which would have compelled him thus to “beat the air” daily. But a Scotch professorship was that which fully satisfied the requirements of his intellectual and moral constitution. He needed to stand among those—a limited and *selected* company—into whose souls he could breathe his own soul, whose aims in life he could elevate, whose purposes he could fix, and to whose principles of action he could impart singleness of direction. As to scientific proficiency, or as to the individual attainments and competency of the men before him, it may be doubted whether his habits and bearing as an academic man were in any remarkable degree adapted to the furtherance of the students in the attainment of a thorough scientific proficiency. Chalmers, at Edinburgh, would send forth men full of soul and high purpose: Mr. Hopkins, at Cambridge, a perennial tide of senior wranglers!

Scotland is now filled with men, and England has more than a few such, who are never weary in giving utterance to their feelings when they speak of those times of happy excitement which they spent in the Moral Philosophy or the Theology Class-room, while Dr. Chalmers held the mind and soul of all present in his powerful grasp. Far are we from saying or surmising that the strictly academic or professorial part of the intellectual nourishment then and there im-

parted was any way less than it might or should have been; probably it was more than the average amount of instruction conveyed by those who have occupied the same position. But we think that, what was more than this—even the whole, or nearly so, of that moral impetus which he communicated to the young men around him, might be wanting, and yet a college system might be reckoned good and efficient in every substantial respect; nay, in some respects the ends of a college course may be attained more completely, and more securely, apart from so much excitement, than along with it.

The extraordinary impulse which Dr. Chalmers gave to the young ministerial mind of Scotland, from the professor's chair, had relation to those great movements which afterwards he originated or promoted. What was needed throughout the country during the years of the national struggle then impending was, that which he with unexampled power imparted. The young ministerial mind of Scotland needed to be put afresh into possession of a thorough and unabated evangelic scheme of belief, as opposed, on the one hand, to all semi-infidel evasions, and, on the other, to a stern and rigid doctrinal *notionalism*, the wordy dialectic fixedness of the Covenanting era. The stiff adherence to principles, and the unbending following out into practice of a general rule, much needed to pass under a process which should retain the *moral substance* of this firmness, while it loosened, and broke up, and scaled off, the time-thickened crust of pertinacity and scrupulosity. A master's hand was needed in Scotland—(one might say a giant's arm)—to rend away from deep and earnest piety its Pharisaism, and to rid Christian morality of Rabbiism. There was needed a GREAT SOUL, and a strong mind, competent to the task of putting upon things Christian, a *Christian* interpretation, instead of a Jewish gloss. Chalmers rendered this service to the Church without relaxing any great principles, and without letting in the latitudinarian feeling. Always serious himself, and observant of whatever is indeed sacred, he could, without risk of mischief, bring down the forces of his robust understanding to bear, with a crushing weight upon any of those solemn frivolities, or punctilious overdoings, which Scotland had retained as keepsakes of its ancient Puritanism. Much was done by Chalmers incidentally among his students, to set their genuine seriousness—their proper conscientiousness—upon a broader and more solid foundation than heretofore it had occupied; but we are far from sure that this same process, so im-

portant and necessary in relation to the spreading impiety of the present times, does not *yet* need to be carried a stage or two farther still.

Much was done also—(we need not doubt it)—by Dr. Chalmers from the Chair, and in the course of his personal communications with his students, to loosen from their minds that overweening regard to the religious usages peculiar to Scotland, which has operated to encase its ministers in their ecclesiastical nationality. His frequent visits to England, and the felicitous friendships which resulted from his intercourse with the ministers and lay members of the Episcopal Church, produced in himself a cordial and very unreserved recognition of the fact that the highest order of piety may, and does flourish, beneath the shadow of Episcopacy; and that a worship thoroughly spiritual may consist with, and does express itself through, a liturgy.

Breadth of feeling, breadth of view, an all-embracing grasp of whatever matters might be before him, and, in a word, a statesman's comprehensiveness, a statesman's sagacity, a statesman's power of continuous attention to details, while retentive of his larger purposes, and ulterior projects, these, as we think, were those characteristics of Chalmers's mind, which, as more or less prominently developed in the class-room, were slowly, and through the course of his twenty years of professorial life, coming to bear upon the rising ministerial body in Scotland, giving to it, not merely a new and extraordinary impulse, but what was not less needed, a far more freely developed Christian intelligence than had heretofore belonged to it. The word which Chalmers might have addressed to the young mind of Scotland, as from year to year it came under his training, was of this sort, (using a little paraphrastic license)—“For God, at this time, and in preparation for the great movements in which we are to act our parts, has not given us the spirit of bondage, and of straitness, and of inferential scrupulosity; but the spirit of love, of power, and of a sound mind.”

If any zealous admirer of this great man were to come forward, and to allege, in his praise, certain specific services which he had rendered to philosophy, in carrying forward, as a teacher, moral and theological science, (or political science,) in the first place, the bringing forward a claim of this sort might perhaps impel us to demur as to certain particulars; but more than this, we should feel that, in so doing, the panegyrist was taking up a questionable, instead of an unquestionable ground of commendation. For, whether or not Dr. Chalmers, as Professor of moral

philosophy, or of theology, has materially advanced sacred and ethical science, it is quite certain that, from his chair, he did render a service to his country which was of incomparably higher importance and value; inasmuch, as he sent forth over its surface, a body of men, who, if they turn not aside from the path whereon he set them forward, may, and with God's help, will, bring about, *within* the enclosure of the Establishment, as well as outside of it, the Christian Regeneration of Scotland. To do this, Chalmers was given to Scotland. Let her see to it then, that the mission of a man whom she delights to name, does not fail of its effect!

The view which we have thus been led to take of Dr. Chalmers's position, while he was occupying academic chairs, would naturally extend itself over the wider field of which he took possession, before the world, as a writer, strenuously and effectively maintaining a certain scheme of doctrines, in political economy, and in its related practical subjects. What those doctrines specifically were, we may find opportunity in a future article to state; and may then, perhaps, venture to advance an opinion as to their quality and value. But at present we may well hold off from all such questions. As a writer upon political economy, upon municipal administration, and upon the statistics of Christian benevolence, Chalmers stands before us—and in this light we think he will appear to the men of the next age, not as the originator, or peculiarly, as the furtherer of SCIENCE; but as the man who, with a suasive power, and a practical efficiency, unequalled, certainly not surpassed by any man of his times, gave an impulse to that altogether *modern* mood of Christian benevolence which concerns itself with the well-being, temporal and spiritual, of the industrial classes, and of the class below these.

This recent product of Christianity, (a product so worthy of it, and so congenial,) this mighty force, working in the bosoms of the privileged—the favoured—the provided for, and which forbids them to slumber upon their comforts, while thousands of their kindred are in extremity of suffering, this modern business-souled benevolence, destined as it yet is, to bring about noiseless renovations throughout the human system, shifting the position of all things, and giving a new form and colour to all, was in a transition state at the moment of Chalmers's coming before the world, for it was just then in course of movement to return upon its true foundations. A word will suffice to explain what we mean.

At length, that is to say, at a time of which some now surviving, may retain a recollection, there took place a sudden move-

ment in HADES. The long rejected, or rather let us say it, the long postponed prayer of DIVES came to be favourably listened to, and LAZARUS, gladly springing upon his feet, left Abraham's bosom on a mission of mercy, and coming up upon earth, he visited in turn the palaces of the "five brethren" of the man who, in his time, had thoughtlessly "fared sumptuously every day." This ghostly messenger, drawing aside the silken curtains of each of these men of indulgence, whispered an alarm in the drowsy ear of each, and flitted away, and returned to his place in Paradise; but it was enough; for a conscience-panic had stirred the deepest impulses of these awakened men, and they shook off their sloth, and went forth among their fellows with an earnest purpose, the world wondering after them, in seeing so new a thing—the rich, the noble, the refined, the philosophic, not as if wrought upon by a fitful and romantic sympathy, which must soon exhaust itself; but effectively roused for labour in behalf of the forgotten millions of the people. The rich man's "five brethren" were, as we have said, at that time, thus awakened from their slumber of selfish ease.—The Man of golden heaps had thus been "pricked to the heart," and the strings of his bags were loosened. The Man of earthly joyousness had taken alarm also, and had sickened of his pleasures. New schemes were put on paper in the counting-house of the Man of business, the British merchant, for he had listened to the same call. The Man of science and of literature also found purposes more noble than the winning of immortality in the temple of fame; and, most to be wondered at, not least to be admired, was the Statesman who, snatching moments from cares he might not abandon, listened to proposals which, heretofore he would have scorned; and he gave his serviceable counsels to the movers of every scheme of beneficence.

In its earlier season of development, this systematic, or organized philanthropy expressed itself in relation, chiefly to those physical evils that affect humanity; and, particularly, to certain definite classes of suffering; thence it went forward toward a more refined concernment for the moral and spiritual destitution of the lower classes; and thence it ripened into its most recent condition, which takes the practical form of ecclesiastical organization, and which embraces the two elements in an adjusted administration of aid and reform, at once spiritual and physical. The process of transition, not easily detected in a conspicuous form at any one moment, becomes evident when we look at the public career of indi-

viduals who stand a few years remote from each other. Thus, for instance, if we compare Howard's visitation of the prisons of Europe, with Elizabeth Fry's labours among the incarcerated wretches of her time, we cannot but note the indications of a progress in public feeling, which is full of meaning. The sighing of the prisoner which Howard had listened to, and to which he had compelled the world to give some heed, had at length come to waken up a more searching and deep-going compassion, and to instigate endeavours for alleviating those of his woes, of which the prisoner himself was regardless.

In a manner analogous to this, and as indicative of a silent but momentous advancement of the Christian spirit, from its rudimental towards its more reflex and more refined expression, the labours of Wilberforce and Clarkson, and of their successors, in behalf of the negro race—labours which are yet waiting to reach their desired consummation—were followed by the great evangelizing enterprises of the time that is now just gone by; and these have been succeeded by those ecclesiastical and colonizing organizations which, under forms so various, have undertaken to administer the funds of voluntary zeal.

Chalmers, as a Political Economist, and more distinctly as the mover of municipal and parochial schemes of beneficent labour, and again, as the champion of Establishments, and as the vindicator of Endowments, and still more decisively as the Founder and Economist of a Church-National, though not Established, fulfilled a function incalculably more fruitful of good toward the masses of the people, than could have been the concocting, and the divulging, and the defence of any new scheme of doctrines in philosophy. Although, therefore, we may hereafter ask, what his philosophy was, and wherein distinguished from that which he found ready to his hand, the answer to such an inquiry is, in our view, unimportant when compared with the fact, that so powerful a mind, impelled by the warmest philanthropy, and informed by Christian principles, came forward to guide the minds of his countrymen, during the season of an extraordinary convulsion.

Chalmers's *moment*, as a political and ecclesiastical economist, was precisely that juncture in the history of Christian benevolence, when a two-fold revulsion was coming about in the world of religious and political feeling. In the first place, the vague and ill-considered, although true-hearted missionary fervour which had rushed out upon the remote wilderness of heathenism, know-

ing scarcely what it intended, and unprepared to meet the sharp disappointments it had provoked, was beginning to collapse, and to think upon its ways; and was, in a somewhat more hopeful manner, applying itself to the vast enterprise before it, under the guidance of dearly-bought experience. But then, in the second place, there was coming on a not less needed and an incalculably momentous revolution, at least in the best constituted minds, which thus expressed itself in tones of self-reproach and amazement:—"We are expending vast revenues, and we are sacrificing the best lives, in the endeavour to Christianize the far-off heathenism of this heathen world;—but we have, meantime, nearly forgotten the fact, that thick around us on every hand, there is a heathenism more virulent in its quality than any which elsewhere, throughout all the world, we shall find—the heathenism of our fellow-citizens, of our nearest neighbours!"

Now the structure of Chalmers's mind, and the decisive tendency of his dispositions, fitted him, peculiarly, for assenting to, and for helping forward, this two-fold revulsion of the religious mind. If a fervent benevolence has ever glowed in a human bosom, it did in his; and he was susceptible also of that species of excitement to which, in a qualified sense, the term *enthusiasm* may be rightfully applied. But, then, with this preparation of the heart, there was conjoined a most robust good sense, an impatience of sentimental inanities—a scorn of unproductive popular agitations—a far-seeing sagacity, as to the workings of any scheme which involves the ordinary impulses of human nature: and withal an extraordinary power of intellect in dealing with, and reducing to order, the details of "matters of business," which placed him always at the post of difficulty, whenever arduous undertakings were in view. Chalmers wanted few, if any, of those natural endowments which might have made him an able minister of State. As thus qualified, then, it was that he put his Hercules shoulder to the wheel of Christian beneficence, at the very moment when the mindless fervour of its spring season was passing on towards a ripened condition of considerate and instructed energy.

It was fraught with these impulsive feelings, and as furnished with these rich mental endowments, that Chalmers gave himself to his favourite subjects—political economy and municipal administration, and, at length to the religious Establishment question; and it was thus, too, shewing himself as a man, and as a clergyman, alive to every call of duty and humanity, that he engaged in those extraordinary ministerial labours which

distinguished his discharge of the pastoral office at Glasgow. Of these labours it could answer no purpose which we have in view here, to take account. Every young man, henceforward devoting himself to the work of the Christian ministry, will take care to make himself fully acquainted, by perusal and study of the volumes before us, with the details of a ministry so instructive. How exciting, and how salutary a tendency is the example therein held up of ministerial devotedness, and of that true and high tone of feeling which leads a man so thoroughly to forget himself and his popularity, while he thinks only of the miseries and the degradations which a faithful discharge of his duties may, in some measure, alleviate or redress! Political economist he was—and so he stood before the world, and so did he shine in his honours, as member of the French Institute, and the like. But he was an economist, *because* a fervent philanthropist; and an economist, *because* his reason told him that Christian principles must be the beginning and the end of all schemes for brightening the homes of the wretched; and because his sense of duty, as a parish minister, so brought him into daily contact with that misery, as that he could never cease to inquire concerning the causes of it, proximate and remote:—

"The dearest object of my earthly existence," he says, "is the elevation of the common people—humanized by Christianity, and raised by the strength of their moral habits, to a higher platform of human nature, and by which they may attain and enjoy the rank and consideration due to enlightened and companionable men."—Vol. iii. p. 433.

Political economy—church extension, and ministerial laboriousness—independent as they might seem, one of the other, were molten into a mass in Chalmers's mind. What he thought on abstract scientific grounds, connected itself with what he saw around him, in the course of his parochial visitations.

"On this day of national calamity, (sermon preached on the death of the Princess Charlotte,) if ever the subject should be adverted to from the pulpit, we may be allowed to express our rivetted convictions on the close alliance that obtains between the political interests and religious character of the country. And I am surely not out of place when, on looking at the mighty mass of a city population, I state my apprehension, that if something be not done to bring this enormous physical strength under the control of Christian and humanized principle, the day may yet come when it may lift against the authorities of the land its brawny vigour, and discharge upon them all the tur-

bulence of its rude and volcanic energy." "Personal and local interests," says Dr. Hanna, "conspired to direct his thoughts into this peculiar channel. He had lately finished his own survey of the Tron Church parish, and by personal inquiries within every dwelling, he had found that, out of 11,120 souls there were not more than 3500 who had seats or were in the habit of worshipping in any Church. In many districts two-thirds of the adult population had wholly cast off the very form and profession of Christianity. Dissent had done much, twice as much, as in its hampered and ill-administered condition, the Established Church had done to arrest the evil; but such, despite of all previous efforts, was the awful magnitude to which that evil had already attained, growing too in a much more rapid ratio than did the general increase of the population. After most anxious and profound reflection—reflection based upon personal and minute observation of the condition and habits of the lowest and poorest of the people, Dr. Chalmers was convinced that the only effective remedy was to purify, remodel, and extend the parochial economy. The extension of that economy was what, perhaps, might be soonest attained, as the want of it could most easily be made apparent."—Vol. ii. p. 140.

A fervent benevolence, informed by Christian motives, lodged in a mind of statesman-like capacity, of extraordinary power in despatching the details of business, and of strong practical tendency, had combined to make this great man the advocate of National Religious Establishments. It was not that he *found* himself pledged to an Establishment, for so he might have continued, passively, with a hesitating compliance with things as they are: such is the position of very many men of note who yield themselves through life to the trying and often perplexing conditions that are inseparable from the working of institutions of this kind. Men of Chalmers's order of mind will stand by ESTABLISHMENTS as long as it is possible so to do. To attribute to interested motives the adherence of such men to the church-and-state principle, is a course insufferably illiberal; it is an imputation which those will be the readiest to cast at others, who, themselves, would be the very last to make a sacrifice for conscience sake.

There is a class of minds, and Chalmers's was an eminent sample of the class, that, from the power and compass of the reasoning faculty, range themselves on the Establishment side of the great problem of the Christian organization of communities. We shall be smartly told that we beg the question in debate when we thus roundly affirm that it is the most broadly constituted minds that take this side; and yet, whether it be relished or not, we must profess to think so; and nothing that has occurred of

late years (not the Scottish Disruption, nor Chalmers's own defection) has shaken our belief that so it is. On the other side we see men, highly to be esteemed and respected as they are, whose spiritual sensitiveness, which is more their characteristic than is their practical wisdom, impels them to draw back, hurt, and grieved, and scandalized, from every contact with things of the world, even with those things to avoid a touch of which we must needs go out of the world. If these good men would but acknowledge the fact, we should hear them confess with sighs, perhaps with tears, that from the secularities and the vulgarities of their own non-established "denomination," they often get rubs as cruel as any that could be inflicted upon them by the sharpest of the sharp corners of a Christianity "by law established." Nay, this is not all, for these over-sensitive good men are sometimes tempted to wish that, instead of having to do with the individually obtruded selfish secularity of the men of their own denomination, they, and all, found their respective interests, and their duties, and their claims, clearly defined by Act of Parliament, or by immovable ecclesiastical usages. The LAW is a tyrant much rather to be chosen than the "thirty tyrants," every one of whom will try his lash upon the shoulders of the "meek of the earth." Along with these good men, and ranging themselves on the side opposed to religious Establishments, are THEORISTS of various sorts, the paintings, and the dottings, and the notches upon whose gay wings we have not leisure, just now, to describe particularly; but who agree in this, that all things actual are quite out of sorts, and that the Millennium means—"universal reform, according to my system." Next come, and never are they wanting in their places, the uncompromising assailants of "authorities"—the totalisers as to every social constitution which assumes to bridle the wantonness of individual pride, and which scalds that pride by putting one man in a position of official superiority towards his fellows.

Chalmers, with all tenderness toward the "weak brother" who "eateth the herbs" of a denominational kitchen-garden, and who drinks water from the shallow and babbling brook of pure Voluntarism, yet could never have endured to stand looking upon the miseries and the degradations of millions of the people, turning the winch of some crazy machinery from year to year, which, a hundred times over, has proved itself to be intrinsically inefficient. Something he must do, and some means he must lay hold of, that will bear the handling, and that will

not break up into dust or splinters when brought to bear upon great evils. As to the spinners of theories he just left them to pursue their innocent pastimes. As to Radicalism, political or religious, he knew human nature well enough to know that, except at moments when the social body is approaching a crisis, this species of malignancy is the least hurtful when it loudly eructates itself, unrebuked and unregarded.

Chalmers would not and could not have condemned the last and the immortally memorable act of his ecclesiastical life—the DISRUPTION, and the founding of the FREE CHURCH—if he had not come up to that great occasion furnished with the principles of a National Establishment, master of its regulated procedures, accustomed to its routine, and personally instinct with that consciousness of dignity which belongs to the members of a great and recognised corporation in correspondence with the State.

But now, if Chalmers carried into the Disruption movement every advantage which his long connexion with the Establishment, and his advocacy of it, had conferred upon him, did he not, it will be asked, in heading the Disruption, lay all these advantages upon the altar of the anti-Establishment cause? Did he not, in this one act, erase his former testimony in favour of Establishments, and practically, if not formally, affirm that to be hopeless and impossible, which, heretofore, he had laboured to recommend as eminently good and useful? We read these facts in a wholly different manner. We render the Disruption and the origination of the Free Church, into terms interpretable into a sense which at some future time shall bring into harmony the earlier writings of this great man, and the later acts of his course.

The Disruption, vast as may be its *present meaning*, in relation to the Christianity of Scotland, doubtless has a further meaning, as bearing upon those ecclesiastical problems which now stand in the pathway of Protestant Christian nations, and which the inevitable course of events must bring to an issue at no very remote time. The religious wellbeing of SCOTLAND must of course be allowed to stand foremost in this instance; but next to it stands that ecclesiastical crisis which ENGLAND waits for, and which, whether she likes it or not, she must pass through. Perplexities analogous to those that attended the controversy between the Church and the State in Scotland, will not fail to make themselves known, in a troublesome manner, as often as any religious movement has place in a Christian country; nor will they be cleared up until certain

misunderstandings, as to the early Church, have been rectified, of which all modern Churches have partaken. To these mistakes we may perhaps advert in a future article.

But we should bring before us, in a succinct form, the Disruption itself, the conditions of the question then at issue, and the course of events which led to it.

At this time of day it might have been deemed unnecessary to affirm that which the public men of the time appear not to have understood, not to have been capable of comprehending—that Scotland is not England—that the Scotch are not the English in a religious sense—and that the Scotch Reformation differed in its tone, its spirit, and its consequent institutions, *essentially* from the English Reformation. But now, if it be a good maxim of government that differences of this sort, how great and deep-seated soever they may be, should be disregarded by a government, and that the components of an empire should all be dealt with, wholesale, in high contempt of their “peculiarities” and of their “crotchets”—if it be true that Nebuchadnezzar does well, in these modern times, when he sends forth his couriers to the “hundred and twenty provinces” of his empire, all bearing the very same ecclesiastical edict; if it be so, then might we well spare ourselves the trouble of entering upon any inquiry as to the fitness of what was done in 1843, on either side of that controversy which broke up the Establishment in Scotland. But we hold a different doctrine as to the course which a government should pursue toward the people under its sway, and therefore we shall use the utmost liberty in our review of those transactions. In using this ample measure of liberty we have the less scruple, because, personally, we have no harboured resentments to give vent to; we have no wounded pride to appease; we have no smothered imprecations to utter in tones of affected candour; we are not Scotch; we have no interests at stake in the Free Church (or in any other Church.) If we care for the one country more than we care for the other, it is for England rather than for Scotland. While we grieve for the damage which has been done in Scotland, we blush the more to remember that it was England that did it. In the upshot Scotland may be the gainer by the Disruption; but a time will assuredly come when the wrong which was then done by England, through the hands of the public men of that time, will avenge itself upon English institutions. Only let another set of English statesmen, some few years hence, and in a similar manner, misunderstand what they will then have to do with; and

the English Church Establishment falls! Again, let the highest considerations that can affect the wellbeing of a people be compromised and contemned, for the sake of some paltry interest, or because a minister cannot afford to risk a dozen votes from his precarious majority; let it be so, and English Christianity will resolve itself into its elements, to be re-assembled and re-composed, we know not how.

When the several forms of doctrine and worship under which the REFORMATION embodied itself are brought under review, *the two extremes* are found to have located themselves in the nearest juxta-position; for a small river is all that, geographically, separates two modes of the same Christianity, between which, ecclesiastically, doctrinally, and ritualistically, a great gulf yawns. This vast dissimilarity symbolizes (as it sprung from) radical differences of national temperament: differences, not incidental and temporary, but deep seated, and very likely long to resist the amalgamating forces of our modern quick intercourse dispensation. The Railway may actually wear itself out before it has quite broken down the two national tempers into one. We do not know that any such assimilation is an issue to be desired. We incline to think the contrary, and undoubtedly we think that those—statesmen to wit—who busy themselves in hastening forward the process, give evidence of the shallowness of their philosophy.

The differences that marked the English and the Scotch Reformation might, no doubt, be traced up, in various particulars, to peculiarities in the temper, and to special circumstances in the training, of the Individual Men who led the way in each country, and who, to some extent, fashioned each church to their private liking. But allowing as much as ought to be allowed to any such influences, we hold it to be certain, that the radical dissimilarity of the two people's moral and intellectual conformation was the main cause of those differences in the ecclesiastical edifices of the two countries, which are so glaring.

So long as the two kingdoms were neighbours only, this religious antagonism did not breed state perplexities, on either side: it only served (and perhaps usefully) to deepen the bed of the Tweed. And when at length the two kingdoms came under one sway, it seemed as if treaties, memorials, parliamentary enactments, and royal promises, might avail to hold in abeyance the difficulties which otherwise were likely to accrue from the political fusion of two races, so opposed the one to the other, in religious temper and feeling. And so

these means *might* have availed, if the lust of spiritual domination could have been persuaded to cast no wistful eye northward. But this could not be: English churchmen, and England's priest-ridden princes could not be quiet so long as Scotland held the hated Puritanism extant. Haman could relish none of his honours until Mordecai should fairly be hanged. What, in a word, is the history of Scotland's wrongs, and what the reason of its martyr times, but this—that treaties and stipulations, the most explicit, protecting Scotland in the enjoyment of her own understanding of Christianity, were as straws in the path of those wilful men, prelates, princes, statesmen, of the Stuart times!

But in *these* times have we not become more philosophical, and are we not more reasonable than our ancestors of the Stuart century were? Do we not better understand what is due to national engagements, as well as to the unwritten and the non-enacted, but understood relationships of the several members of a great imperial community? We are so, in certain instances. How careful, for instance, have we shown ourselves not to tread on the toes of our Roman Catholic fellow-citizens, even when they are spurred and ready to ride roughshod over our heads! And how sensitively have we behaved ourselves towards the delicate "religious peculiarities" of the subjugated people of India! But Scotland—ought it to look for the same measure of indulgence?

Among the many dissimilarities that form the contrast between the English and the Scottish forms of the same Christianity, that one which is the most striking, as one crosses the border, on a Sunday, although it has so often been referred to, has not been well understood, (scarcely at all regarded in England,) in its bearing upon the great question which has lately been agitated between the Scotch Established Church and the English Government. The English Sunday service is *mainly* ritualistic; the Scotch is *mainly* concionative. In England the church-going bell calls the people together to *worship*: Scotland clusters its people to *hear a preachment*. In England the sermon is a twenty minutes' supplement to the service; well to be subjoined to it, if, and when, it can be had; yet by no means an indispensable element of the congregational routine. In Scotland, not only is the sermon the main matter, and it is lengthily accordingly, and it is elaborately prepared, and it is critically listened to—Bible in hand; but the very prayers are the minister's creation, at the moment; whether better or worse,

they are what the minister, as an individual, is qualified to deal out to the people. These exercises of the individual man—both hortatory and devotional—are either adapted to the tastes of the congregation, or they are not so, and are offensive to it; they either delight and comfort the people, or grievously offend them. In the one country the minister's prime qualification consists in his *official authenticity*; in the other country his qualifications are those of his mind, temper, tone, manner, and function, as a man, as a Christian, and as a preacher. In the one country the personal difference between one clergyman and another is an affair of less than vital consequence: in the other country this difference touches to the quick the soul of the people—that is to say, of every frequenter of Church who is better than a listless filler-out of eighteen inches' pew-room.

Grant it, that we have here stated the contrast between England and Scotland in terms somewhat absolute, and which may be open to exceptions. Nevertheless, *mainly* the difference is just such as we here present it. Whenever an English congregation comes into a spiritualized condition (which often it does) such as to put, in its view, the *preacher* foremost, and the *clergyman* aftermost, then, and to this extent, it has gone off from its normal standing-place, as an assemblage convened for worship, according to the rites of the Episcopal Church. Some element of Methodism must have lodged itself in the bosom, as well of the preacher as of the people, when so it is. But it is not so in Scotland; Scotland wants no influx of Methodism for bringing its people into a vivid condition of soul-contact with its ministry. People and preacher are commingled in one harmony, *authentically*, and they are in perfect accordance with the IDEA of the national faith, when the listeners to the sermon, and to the prayers also, yield themselves to the guiding hand of their own loved minister. A Scotch congregation is then in its normal condition, when thus the individual spirit of the minister comes into spiritual communion with the minds around him.

Such are the plain facts which so broadly distinguish the Scotch from the English Sunday feeling. Now, will any one be audacious enough to affirm that PATRONAGE is just the same thing in the one country as it is in the other? Is it endurable to listen to the frigid barbarism of those who tell us that the mode of appointing ministers to parishes which is good for England—(is it *good*?) is good also for Scotland? Is it not so? If men, as Christians, may call their

souls their own, it is nothing less than an atrocity to treat the deep religious instinct which impels a Scotch congregation to desire a minister who can bring himself near to its heart, as a whim to which no heed should be given. We need not wonder when we find English public men, who themselves have no hearts, or none on a Sunday, shewing that they are incapable of understanding feelings of this order. To such men what signifies the individual difference between the Rev. Mr. B. and the Rev. Mr. C., whose fifteen minutes' inanities it would need very keen and practised ears to distinguish one from the other? But the Scotchmen, the statesmen at the time of the Disruption, who so wantonly sported with the feelings of their countrymen, could not be ignorant of the vastness of that national difference, which, while it makes the right of the patron just a supportable usurpation in England, renders it an insufferable usurpation in Scotland! Yes, but has not Scotland, in times past, actually allowed this grievance to be fastened on her neck? She has done so; yet never without exacting conditions, and uttering remonstrances; and so it is that the infatuated outrage which was perpetrated by Government, nine years back, takes to itself the character of a proceeding worse than would be the putting a cruel contempt upon a sensitive people; for it was substantially a breach of public faith—it was a treason.

The relationship of an English clergyman to his parishioners being what it is, and the feelings and habits of the people being what they are, so long as there is going on in the clerical body, an improving tone, and an always rising regard for decorum, and especially while that style of sedulous attention to the religious condition of the people which has lately shewn itself so generally, continues unabated, the existing practice as to patronage is not likely to excite any feeling leading to popular resistance; and especially if (as at present) patronage, as exercised by the Crown, and by many of the aristocracy, is seen to give heed to the personal merits of the presentee, and is employed manifestly with a view to the welfare of the people.

In Scotland no ameliorations or palliatives of this kind, even if they had place, could avail for bringing patronage into a tolerable position toward the people; or a position that should be analogous to that which it occupies as related to the church-going population of England. It is indeed true that, through cycles of years, the people of Scotland may have slumbered, and therefore may have endured what was so contrary to

their proper and to their better feelings. But it is quite certain that, between the moment of awakening and the utterance of a loud complaint on this head, the interval will be very short. England *may* live religiously under the yoke of patronage; but as often as Scotland becomes spiritually alive she will struggle to throw it off. So it has been: so it will be again.

As to the Disruption of 1843, a greater or a less share in that convulsion, and in the proceedings which led to it, may be assigned to Dr. Chalmers individually. It may not be possible, in fact, rightfully to distribute to every man therein concerned his exact proportion of the general responsibility incurred by the leaders of the Free Church movement. Certainly *we* shall attempt no such apportionment, whether it be of praise or of blame; nor is it of much consequence to fix the relative amount of these individual deservings. This, meanwhile, is abundantly evident, that the great man whose public course is now in review, was just so far the author and the mover of the Disruption as he, by his energetic preaching, his abounding labours, his writings, and his commanding influence, as a theological Professor, had been the instrument of Scotland's awaking to a state of evangelical vitality. What the course of events might have been if he had held himself entirely aloof from ecclesiastical affairs, no one should venture to say; but even if he had done so, the same agitation must, sooner or later, have come on. The fatal error of the Government and of the public men, generally, of that time, consisted in this, that, in attributing the actual agitation to the personal influence of Dr. Chalmers, and of a few men his associates, they quite failed to perceive, or to understand that deeper heaving of Scotland's heart, of which (mainly) he had been the instrument, and of which the "Non-intrusion" agitation was only an incidental consequence. These public men—even the most intelligent of them, had no eye to see, no ear to hear, no heart to understand, that which Chalmers and his friends had already effected, as God's ministers, in waking their countrymen from their long slumber of formality, of Moderatism, and of infidelity. They thought, therefore, that the hubbub which this famous orator had given rise to, about this, that, or the other pretended invasion of Church privileges by the Court of Session, would presently subside, and that the display of a little firmness on the part of Government would suffice for bringing this momentary disturbance to a speedy and ignominious end. Foolish supposition! Yet, on the ground of it, Scot-

land was split, the domestic harmony of many families was blighted, the best and ablest men that the Established Church had ever had at its command were driven from their flocks and their homes:—the existence of *two* Establishments was put in peril; and more than this, an illustrious example of moral courage and constancy was entered upon the pages of history, which the men of another time will read—will ponder, and will follow;—and when they do so, the consequence will serve to attach an immortal obloquy to the names of the public men to whose blindness the Disruption must be attributed.

If, on this occasion, and in such a connexion, we must employ the ill-sounding word—"Party," we must remind our readers that, in consequence of the religious revival which marked the early years of this century, in Scotland, and with which Dr. Chalmers's preaching and writings had so much to do, accessions were constantly making to the evangelical party, in the GENERAL ASSEMBLY; the Moderate majority, in proportion, declining; while the popular feeling went on, more and more decisively, to sustain, and to enhearten the former, and to render the position of the latter increasingly precarious. At length it became manifest that the evangelical members of the Assembly would see their way open to the exercise of a preponderating influence, and that it would soon be competent to them to carry measures tending to renovate the Church, according to its own *idea*, as embodied in its Confessions and Formularies. The tendency was not to *innovate*, or even to *reform*, in the sense of abrogating what was extant, or of instituting things new; but in a word, the ruling desire was to reanimate or to vivify the body, which had suffered paralysis.

In going about to effect this reanimation, the evangelical ministers could not suppose themselves to be taking a blame-worthy, or even a hazardous course, when they laid their hands upon explicit passages in the authentic documents of their Church, and announced their wish to restore what had fallen into desuetude, and to regain what was once the undisputed right of the people, and of their ministers. It may indeed often be a question, calling for all the wisdom which a Church has at its command, whether such *restorations* are, in fact, desirable, or are practicable; or whether a community has not, in the course of a century or two, passed forward far beyond the applicable intention of its antiquated institutions;—whether such institutions, or modes of procedure, ought not to be thought of as super-

annuated, defunct, and good for nothing but to be forgotten.

This will not be the judgment passed upon those usages or principles which, while they are elementary constituents of an extant institution, have been removed from it surreptitiously—have been set off from it by means of some *foreign* interference, have been snatched away by reckless, selfish, and lawless hands; and when such subductions have not been resisted, only because the wronged parties were, at the time, somnolent, or were false to their trust. This, we think, is much about the state of the case as to the whole of that controversy between the Church of Scotland and the Government, which ended in the Disruption of 1843. We think so, standing as we do a thousand miles off from the Free Church, and in no ways implicated in its credit, or in its destinies.

What we have just above said, as to the essential and immeasurable difference which makes up the contrast between the Established Churches of England and Scotland, may suffice for shewing that, though a revival of religious feeling may advance some way within the former (as it has done) and yet not bring into jeopardy the (rights?) of the patron in presenting to benefices—the wishes of the people no way consulted or considered—no revival spreading beyond a parish or two, no general recovery of religious feeling could possibly take place in Scotland, unaccompanied by a deep-felt, and, probably, vehemently uttered desire to modify at least, the patron's influence; or to subject it to *some* conditions rendering it less intolerable;—or, if that might be, to recover for the Church and the people, the privileges that had been snatched and stolen from them at a moment when the clergy had become secularized, and the people were benumbed. The cry—the outcry, will be heard from every side—“give us what we have been wrongfully deprived of.”

If at the moment of this religious revival there had been among the statesmen of the time, Whig or Tory, one—we do not say, a spiritually-minded and a Christian man, but one, conversant with religious history, and of sagacity to take note of what was going on in Scotland, and to interpret those events aright, and to forecast their inevitable issues—if there had been one such man at hand, it would have been easy for him to make way, legally, for that movement, thus saving the Establishment, and saving patronage too, so far as it ought to have been saved. No such mind—no such large soul was at hand. Scotland, therefore, fell into the hands, not merely of worldly-minded men, but of merely technical men—men of routine, and

lawyers—men whose heads were stuffed with verbalities;—men whose tact would much sooner have enabled them to beseech themselves well in office at the Sublime Porte, or under the emperor of China, than to apprehend those heavings of the heart, and those revoltings of the understanding which agitate a parish in Scotland upon which a godless laird has forced a godless minister.

Although, as to many of our readers, or to most of them, the facts we shall now have to advert to, need no repetition, yet we may fairly assume it as probable, as to some who look into these pages, that those facts are not familiar. Using all brevity, we shall therefore adduce them; and, as far as we can, shall follow, or avail ourselves of, Dr. Hanna's statements, as presented in the volumes before us.

Dr. Chalmers found himself Moderator of the General Assembly of May 1832. His position as such forbade his taking a part, directly, in a discussion over which he then presided, and which touched the question of patronage in a vital manner. Eight presbyteries and three synods had sent up overtures (petitions) to the supreme ecclesiastical court, entreating the Assembly to devise means, such as might avail to prevent the intrusion upon parishes of ministers unacceptable to the congregation; in a word, for giving reality to that which had become a mere form, namely—The *Call* of the people. When the parish became vacant the immemorial usage of the Church of Scotland, in inducting a clergyman, had been of this sort:—the patron, by a deed or declaration, laid upon the table of the presbytery, nominates to the vacant living, and therein requires it to “take trial of the qualifications” of the person so presented; and then, having found him duly qualified for the function of the ministry, at the parish of—— (a trial corresponding with the bishop's examination of candidates for holy orders) to admit and receive him thereto, and give him his act of ordination and admission, in due form. In pursuance of this requisition the presbytery enjoins the presentee to preach in the vacant Church, on one or two Sundays named, to the end that “the people over whom he is to be ordained, may have some knowledge and trial of his qualifications.” After this trial has been had, the presbytery meets in the Church of the vacant parish, for the purpose of “moderating in, or presiding at the call.” At this meeting, and after divine service, a paper is presented to this effect: “We, the heritors, elders, heads of families, and parishioners of the parish of——, taking into consideration the present destitute state of the said parish, through the want of a

gospel ministry among us, occasioned by the death of our late pastor, and being satisfied with the learning, abilities, and other good qualifications of you, Mr. A. B., and having heard you preach to our satisfaction and edification, do hereby invite and call you, the said Mr. A. B., to take the charge and oversight of this parish, and to come and labour among us, in the work of the gospel ministry, hereby promising to you all due respect and encouragement in the Lord. We likewise entreat the reverend presbytery of — to approve and concur with this, our most cordial call, and to use all proper means for making the same effectual, by your ordination and settlement among us, as soon as the steps necessary thereto will admit. In witness whereof we subscribe these presents."

The people are invited accordingly to sign this invitation, in the presence of the presbytery; which done, they, the presbytery, proceed to sit in judgment upon the call, and finding it sufficient, enter next upon the trial of the literary and theological attainments of the presentee. This trial duly had, they appoint a Sunday for "serving the edict," that is to say, for announcing to the congregation the proposed day of ordination; to which announcement is appended a notification, that, if any one knows any reason against the admission of the presentee, he is to present himself before the Presbytery, and give in the same. On the day fixed for the ordination, proclamation is again made by an officer of the Court, giving opportunity to any who may wish to advance objections to the life or doctrine of the presentee, so to do, and to make good his objections as he can. No such objections having been advanced, the presentee is required, in hearing of the congregation, to answer various questions, the last of which is thus worded,—"Do you accept and close with the call to be pastor of this parish, and promise through grace to perform all the duties of a faithful minister among this people?" Neither in this question, nor in the affirmative reply to it, is any allusion made to the patron or to his presentation. *On this occasion* patronage is ignored. Ordination then takes place in the mode used in the Presbyterian Church.

This form, a mere fiction as it had become of late years, is yet full of meaning; for it recalls a *reality* of which the people of Scotland had been despoiled; and it symbolizes a relationship to which nothing in the English Church corresponds. On the ground of this form of induction, albeit the substance it represented had been removed, the reanimated Church was fully warranted in seeking

to recover for the people what had been lost. There should be noted in this Form these points, namely,—The patron brings forward his man, the presentee; but no ordination takes place, and no entrance upon the temporalities of the benefice is granted to him until after the presentee has been listened to by the parishioners, approved by them, and by them invited to become their pastor. Such is the condition under which Patronage is allowed to take its course in the Church of Scotland. This condition, let us mark it, does homage to that principle, historically anterior to the allowance of the patron's intervention, which pervades the Presbyterian system of discipline, government, and worship, and the operation of which places that system in a point of extreme contrast with the English Episcopacy, and its liturgical worship. Let it be noted that, until the people have approved the presentee, and have given him their call, even the preliminary inquiry as to his literary and religious qualifications is not entered upon. Whether he be a fit man to exercise the Christian ministry *anywhere* is not authentically known until the people of the parish before which he appears have said, "We wish him (if found to be otherwise qualified) to become our pastor."

Patronage was saddled upon Scotland by the Act of 1712, nevertheless the above described form of induction long afterwards retained its significance; and in very many instances (we here follow Dr. Hanna) the popular voice took effect, the patron's presentee having been frequently rejected by the Presbytery, solely on the ground of the opposition of the parishioners. Never in those times was the signature of three or four individuals allowed to pass as a sufficient call. But the spread of lax principles among the clergy themselves, and the growth of a thoroughly secular feeling, inclined them more and more to throw themselves upon the good chances of patronage; and to rid themselves, as far as possible, of the troublesome intervention of the people. Was it to be endured that a man who had a benefice straight before him, through the favour of a noble friend, should be condemned to stand, in tremulous uncertainty, for two Sundays, before his masters—the clowns and bigots of a country parish? "Like parson, like people." The people, ministered to through a course of years by men of this worldly stamp, would easily slide into that place of acquiescent nihilism to which their superiors beckoned them to retire. Patron, parson, people, being all of one mind, "the house" and its "goods were in peace." So things went on until that time came on when

Scotland's heart warmed and beat again. Thenceforward, and when at length the people and their ministers stood up on their feet, fronting each other, and became reciprocally conscious of what this relationship means—thenceforward, either the patron must return to his *original position*, or ministers and people must take their own in their own way. The patron, by help of the English government, kept his ground, and the Disruption ensued by sheer necessity.

In the course of time, after the restoration of patronage, the General Assembly decided that effect should be given to the Patron's presentation, *in all cases*, however decisive and unanimous might be the opposition of the people. The attachment of a single name to the call was held to render it valid, and, on the ground of such a farce, the Presbytery was enjoined to induct and ordain. Still, however, the Church continued to declare that this "Call," which it had allowed to be virtually annulled, was "agreeable to its immemorial and constitutional practice, and that it ought to be retained." So said the General Assembly of 1782. Notwithstanding these enacted incongruities, there were never wanting some of the clergy who protested against this disregard, at once of the letter and of the spirit of the Presbyterian Establishment. Some Presbyteries prayed to be excused from acting their part in the painful ceremonial of ordination, where the people were recusant. Some clergymen, rather than do so, relinquished their benefices.

The people, after finding that appeal to the General Assembly availed them nothing, in some instances adopted violent means to prevent the induction of an obnoxious minister. Sometimes the patron's darling was safely lodged in his Church and manse by the bayonet. Often a sullen acquiescence followed these compulsory inductions; and very often the people sought relief in the natural and rightful mode of providing for themselves a chapel and a minister. In the course of half a century more than 100,000 of the people had thus been driven to secede from the Establishment.

Insanity is curable, but not infatuation; interested folly never learns wisdom; but the time of its confusion was now drawing on. Some will tell us that the patronage infatuation did triumph in 1843. So it did; but it triumphed in a sense which nothing short of ineffable folly will prompt a man to speak of as if it should be gloried in.

The leading men of the Church, Chalmers and others, did not wish for an absolute abrogation of patronage. They well knew that the method of appointing ministers to pa-

rishes or congregations is a problem of extreme difficulty. In no direction could they look around and find a Church system and practice which, in itself, was desirable, or which was rather to be chosen, than would have been the existing practice of the Church of Scotland, if only some reasonable modifications of the patron's right, securing the people against intolerable oppressions, could have been admitted.

As it had been by a series of decisions contravening the popular voice that the "Call" had been gradually reduced to a nullity, Dr. Chalmers proposed that, instead of attempting to legislate on the general question, the Assembly, in which the Evangelical party was every year gaining ground, should, by a series of decisions, as cases arose, come to decisions in the contrary sense—determining, as circumstances might dictate, what number of signatures, or what proportion, in a parish, should be held sufficient for giving validity to a Call. This course, however, though it seemed eligible, would have perpetuated controversy and litigation; and it was not adopted. A legislative Act of the Assembly, fixing a uniform practice, was thought more advisable. Dr. Chalmers then urged an application to Government to legalize, by Act of Parliament, the proposed Act of the Church. Some, who better knew what might be looked for from Government, and from an English Parliament, (Lord Moncrieff was of this opinion,) earnestly deprecated any such application; and it was not then attempted.

Of the several legislative modes of applying a check to the wanton exercise of patronage, that one was at length preferred which assumed the mildest and most reasonable form, and which was embodied in the "Veto Act." The import of this Act was, that in any case in which a majority of the parishioners came forward to declare their disapproval of the patron's presentee, this dissent should be held to bar the settlement. The introduction of this measure in the General Assembly of 1833 was assigned to Dr. Chalmers. In pleading for this measure he showed that it was not a novelty, but a revival only of the practice of those times immediately following 1649 and 1690, when the power of negation, as a force in reserve, rather than in operation, being lodged with the people, the Church of Scotland was in its most prosperous condition. "Persecution put an end to the one period, and unrestricted patronage put an end to the other." The negative which it was proposed to leave with the people, as uttered by a majority, should be held a sufficient bar in *itself*, apart from reasons assigned, which, as Dr. Chalmers al-

leged, might often be the most valid and the most reasonable, in fact, when they were of a sort to which the people could give no distinct utterance. The dissent of a majority, unsustained by reasons alleged, should only be disregarded in bar of the presentation, when it could be clearly proved to take its rise from some "corrupt and malicious combination."

This motion was lost in the Assembly of 1833, by a majority of twelve against it. But as modified by Lord Moncrieff, and introduced by him, it was carried in the General Assembly of 1834. It was technically termed "an Overture and Interim Act on Calls:" and was declaratory to this effect—*generally*, that it is contrary to the fundamental law of the Church for any pastor to be intruded into any congregation, contrary to the will of the people: and then, specially, it is declared that, in any case, if "the major part of the male heads of families," members of the vacant congregation, and in full communion with the Church, shall disapprove of the person in whose favour the call is proposed to be moderated in, such disapproval shall be deemed sufficient ground for the Presbytery rejecting such person, and that he shall be rejected accordingly." But it was required that all persons so dissenting should, when required, solemnly declare in presence of the Presbytery, that they are not actuated by factious or malicious motives; but only by a regard to the spiritual interests of themselves, or the congregation. Any one of the dissentients refusing so to declare, his vote is rejected.

Such was the VETO LAW. It had been maturely considered, it had received the approval of the most eminent legal persons, and it had been sanctioned by the legal and political advisers of the Crown in Scotland. More than this, or more, if we think of subsequent events, it had been warmly commended by Lord Brougham, then Lord Chancellor, in the House of Lords.

"The late proceedings in the General Assembly (in passing the Veto Law) have done more to facilitate the adoption of measures which shall set that important question of *Patronage* at rest, upon a footing advantageous to the community, and that shall be safe and beneficial to the Establishment, and in every respect desirable, than any other course that could have been taken; for it would have been premature if the Legislature had adopted any measure without the acquiescence of that important body, as no good could have resulted from it. I am glad that the wisdom of the General Assembly has been devoted to this subject, and that the result of its deliberations has been these important resolutions (the Veto Act) which were passed at the last meeting."—Vol. iii. p. 362.

Such an approval might seem enough, at least to screen the Assembly of 1834 from severe reprehension, as if it had acted precipitately, or at the impulse of those fanatical motives which sometimes take their course in clerical assemblages. Then, again, in the year 1836, a fit occasion presenting itself, Sir George Clerk, in the House of Commons, followed by Sir James Graham, did, in the most decisive terms, assert the constitutional liberties of the Church of Scotland, and its rightful exemption from the interference of the secular courts, in all matters spiritual; that is to say, when acting upon the ground of its independence, *as secured to it by the Act of Union*, and when carrying out its own disciplinary laws. Sir James Graham said,—

"What the people of Scotland had conquered with their arms had been recognised and guaranteed to them by repeated Acts of Parliament, and the Act of Union had recognised the independence of their Church as complete and entire. The Church of Scotland acknowledged the right of no authority to interfere with their ecclesiastical government. They recognise not the sovereign of these realms as the Head of their Church, and he (Sir J. Graham) would always contend for the privileges which that Church had guaranteed to it by the Union."

We pointedly request our English and Episcopalian readers to note these testimonies of men so competent to render them, and uttered where they were uttered.

We, on this *southern* side of the Tweed, have been wonderfully slow to apprehend the depth and the vitality of the differences which distinguish the two Establishments. The very same acts and courses of proceeding which, if adopted by the English clergy, would intend little less than a *Revolution*, in Scotland mean only a *Reclamation* of solemnly-admitted rights. Too often, and too far, the Disruption has been looked at *Anglicè*, and therefore as a revolt, or as an assumption of new ground. In this way *we* English have utterly misunderstood the Disruption movement. Sir Robert Peel, and the men who then surrounded him, seemed in some degree conscious of the idiosyncrasy of the Scottish Establishment, and he, as it appears, would cordially have sustained it in those endeavours to effect Church Extension which Dr. Chalmers so earnestly promoted. As to the Whigs, the feeling was of another sort;—with an ear open to Romanism, or to any form of assault upon Protestant Establishments, they had a cold shoulder for the Church: this was the rule. It should in justice be said that Lord John Russell's personal feelings towards the Scottish Establishment (as toward the English) were less hostile, less jealous, and supercilious, than were those of his colleagues.

From the subject of Church Extension we must, in this present article, entirely abstain. We say so just now, because it intervenes between the earlier movements of the Church, in relation to Patronage, and the issue of the same; and so likewise must we remit to another occasion, Dr. Chalmers's advocacy of Religious Establishments, which, in like manner, here intervenes.

The year 1838 brings before us the beginning of the end of the NON-INTRUSION controversy; and each of the following five years gave a new prominence to the fact that the *real* controversy between the Church and the Government had a far deeper meaning than that which obviously attached to it, in relation to Patronage; and that the issue of the conflict must either be to overthrow, to exclude, and to trample upon, the then reviving spiritual life of Scotland, or to allow and promote it, as then it was growing and acting within the Establishment. In this conflict, the patron's interests were indeed zealously protected; but to have secured these would not have satisfied those whose hearts were set upon the repression and expulsion of the Evangelic party, or what would have been better, their humiliation, by bringing the principal promoters of it before the world in the degraded attitude of men who, after making a great stir and noise, became suddenly quiet when they found their temporalities to be in jeopardy. To effect *this* end, all the measures of Government were steadily directed, under a confident persuasion (this is the besetting error of public men) that conscience would break down, and that "discretion" would have its triumph.

In rapid succession, throughout the Church, mere forms and mockeries were, at this time, being displaced by realities. The Eldership had been reformed, regard being had, in the appointment to this office, to the personal qualification of the men who were to fill it. Candidates for the ministry were subjected to an effective examination, and a necessary discipline was applied to cases of ministerial delinquency. The relationship connecting Presbyteries with Synods, and these with the General Assembly, were rendered effective. At the same time obstacles to communion with other orthodox Churches were removed; and one of the several seceding bodies had returned to its pale; and moreover, all those projects of Christian benevolence which Christian hearts devise, received a hearing, and were put in act. In the course of five years, the contributions of the Church in promotion of religious and charitable purposes, had become

fourteen times greater than they had hitherto been. Of this period, Dr. Chalmers says:—

"We abolished the union of offices,—we are planting schools,—we are multiplying chapels,—we are sending forth missionaries to distant parts of the world,—we have purified and invigorated the discipline,—we are extending the church, and rallying our population round its venerable standard,—we are bringing the sectaries again within its pale,—and last, though not least, we have reformed the patronage; and our licentiates, instead of a tutorship in the families of the great, as their stepping-stone to preferment, now betake themselves to parochial assistantship, or to a preaching station, with its correspondent home-walk of Christian usefulness among the families of the surrounding poor, as the likeliest passage to a higher place in their profession even as it is the best preparation for the duties of their high calling. And not only is the visible glow of this great and wholesome reform abroad over the country, or in the outer departments of the Church; but in the business of its courts and judicatories, in the General Assembly itself, there is the same great and obvious reformation; so that, instead of the ecclesiastico-political arena which it once was, more at least than half its time is taken up with the beseeching cares of a great moral institute, devising for the Christian good, and the best interests of men, both at home and abroad."

Was it well done to assail and to discourage all this reviving energy? Was it wisely done in a Government, to drive beyond the pale of the Establishment, men who were thus labouring for its good? Was it discreet in those who had one Establishment in England to uphold, and another in Ireland to defend—so hard to be defended, to give the world a lesson to this effect—That no indulgence *within an Establishment* should be granted to laborious faithfulness, or to effective zeal? If the same men had been Irish priests, or English dissenters, their merits would have been acknowledged, and their "claims of right" allowed!

Dr. Hanna, in the sixth chapter of the fourth volume, narrates succinctly, clearly, and temperately, the circumstances attaching to the much-noised AUCHTERARDER case. Our readers, if not already conversant with these circumstances, will best become so in perusing these Memoirs. So far as any purpose now in view is concerned, the meaning of this case may be given in a few words.—We have seen that the VETO LAW, passed by the General Assembly of 1834, had obtained the approval of those public men whose opinion should be regarded as having the most validity in such an instance. The Church believed that this Act, especially when thus authenticated, although it had not become law, by Act of Parliament, did mean something, and that it might be used

as occasion should demand. An occasion did very soon occur, and it offered a case which stood clear of every imaginable ambiguity. The patron's man had preached in the Church twice or thrice, and then, from out of a population of 3000 souls—precisely two persons came forward to sign the call! When, in compliance with the terms of the recent act, the heads of families, in full communion, were required to tender their dissent, 287, out of 300, who were entitled to do so, came forward to declare themselves opposed to the settlement of the presentee; and all these dissidents professed their readiness to make the required declaration, as to the motives of their disapproval. This disapproval was persisted in; and when, on appeal to the General Assembly the rejection of the presentee was sustained, on the ground of the Veto Act, the patron and presentee carried the case before the civil court—the Court of Session—by instituting an action against the Presbytery. In a word, this court—eight to five of the judges—decided against the Church—against its ancient usages, as well as in contravention of its recently passed Act. The minority, included (one is glad to record it) Lord Jeffrey.

This decision of the Court of Session still left some obscurity on the two main questions then at issue, namely, the legality of the Veto Law, as the act of the Church:—and the competence of the civil court to interfere *beyond the limit of regulating the destination of the benefice*. It might determine the cause, ignoring the act of the Church—the Veto Act—and, therefore, disposing of the *benefice*; and yet it might abstain from the attempt to over-ride the purely spiritual function of the Church, the exercise of which had been so explicitly secured to it by Acts of Parliament, and by the terms of the Act of Union. For the purpose of removing these ambiguities, the General Assembly of 1838 carried the case, by appeal, up to the House of Lords. In taking this course the Church, by a majority in the General Assembly of 183 to 142, passed a resolution, in the terms of which it professed its willingness to yield implicit obedience to the civil authorities, in all matters touching “civil rights and emoluments;” but reserving the *rights* and the *duties* of the Church, as a spiritual body, to exercise its spiritual functions, exempt from all interference. In this resolution the Church announced its determination to stand its ground, as so professed, and, as a necessary consequence, to enforce obedience upon its own office-bearers and members, as thus

related to itself;—that is to say, while discharging its purely spiritual functions.

In the following year the cause was heard before the Lords, when, under the direction of Lords Brougham and Cottenham, the appeal was dismissed, and the sentence of the Court of Session was confirmed. In the interval of five years, since Lord Brougham had uttered his approval of the Veto Act, as above cited, he and other Statesmen had, no doubt, become convinced that, not only patronage, but the subserviency of the clergy of *three* Establishments was being put in jeopardy by the evangelic movement which was then taking place in Scotland; and, therefore, that, notwithstanding the heretofore recognised spiritual independence of the Scottish Church, an absolute bar must be placed across its path, when presuming to exercise any, even the most unquestionably spiritual of its functions. From this time forward, the policy of the Government, whether Whig or Tory, had one conspicuous intention—namely, to quash all vitality, and to sustain or encourage a slavish compliance, on the part of the clergy, and to frighten the people from off that ground of spontaneous feeling and free action, on which they were taking up a position.

We must be far from wishing to enter upon questions, as between one portion of the clergy of the Scotch Establishment and another;—between the majority and the *then* minority—the Evangelic and the Moderate party. It is *now* of far more importance, besides that it is a more seemly course, to regard the question of the Disruption as it then stood and as it now stands, and as it will, doubtless, stand in the view of the time coming—as a question between the Church of Scotland, renovated and becoming conscious of its own principles, and the Public Men of that time, whose misfortune it was to take part, as antagonists, in a movement which they wholly failed to understand.

As to those of the clergy who, with a too forward zeal, lent themselves to the usurpations and encroachments of the Civil Courts, and who, in so doing, aided the delusion under which the Government was acting, great allowance should always be made for men acting in a similar manner, and in adherence to the principles and the feelings which, from their entrance upon life, had always ruled their conduct. Every era of movement finds its Erasmus, and he always, his numerous followers. There was a ground upon which those who yielded themselves so obsequiously to the pleasure of the Court of Session might easily persuade themselves that, in so doing, they were rendering to

Cæsar nothing more than was his due. As to those who thus thought, we have no quarrel with them. Yet it cannot be doubted that, if these same men, as a body, (excepting only the thoroughly secular-minded few among them,) had then had magnanimity enough to waive the theological differences subsisting between themselves and their brethren—the remonstrant majority, and if they had shewn themselves alive to the spirit, and jealous for the fundamental principle of their Church, statesmen must at once have seen their error in attempting to reduce the Church of Scotland to a condition which, though apparently analogous to that of the Church of England, was in fact out of all harmony with its own constitutions—with its history—with the spirit of its worship, and with its discipline, as well as with the sturdy temper of the people. One is tempted to imagine, as to the men who then, in so cruel a manner sported with the welfare of Scotland, that not one of them had ever spent a fortnight upon its soil, or had ever been guilty of the condescension of worshipping God in one of its Churches.

But let oblivion rest for ever upon the circumstances of the conflict as carried on within the Church, on those several occasions that arose to alienate its ministers, one from another! The Court of Session went on, during the five years preceding the Disruption, to show its determination to overrule, absolutely, every act of the Church. It did so, as it seems, on the comprehensive ground that the Church can do nothing which does not immediately, or remotely, touch, or trench upon, or put in peril, men's secular interests, or rights, or their reputation. If it refuse to ordain an objectionable man, in so doing it openly trespasses upon the patron's preserves, and spoils the fortunes of the presentee! Nay, although when, refusing to ordain a man, it fully and fairly relinquished the temporalities of the parish, it still inflicted a civil injury upon the presentee's character, either as a man, or as a minister; and, therefore, he might rightfully enter an action to recover damages. There was, in fact, no one act of discipline, how necessary soever, or merely spiritual, which might not be thus construed as involving the infliction of a civil wrong. And thus it was that the civil court did interpret each of those acts of the Church which, from this time forward, were brought under its review.

The Parliament of 1840 was implored by the people of Scotland, in petitions more numerous signed than on any occasion since the times of the Reform agitation, to protect the Church from those encroach-

ments. Deputations were despatched—interviews with statesmen of both parties were had;—bland things were uttered, in frivolous style by one set of them, more seriously and more speciously by the other set; but all meaning nothing, as the issue too plainly shewed. So far as the difference between the evangelical party in the Church and English statesmen was avowed by these, it turned upon the question whether the expressed disinclination of the parishioners towards the patron's patentee, *when it was of that sort which could not be formally substantiated by reasons clearly defined*, should be held to be a sufficient ground of rejection—as *judged of by the presbytery*. We are willing says Dr. Chalmers, in a letter to Lord Aberdeen, January 27th, 1840,—

"That reasons should always accompany dissent, and that these reasons should always be dealt with and canvassed to the utmost; but we are not willing that we should be bound to admit the presentee, if the people do not make good their reasons. On the contrary, we hold ourselves free, though not obliged, to exclude a presentee because of the strength of the popular dislike, though not substantiated by express reasons.—a case which may occur, though not once in a hundred, I believe not once in a thousand times."—Vol. iv. p. 156.

The bill introduced by Lord Aberdeen, in 1840,—

"Altogether disallowed a dissent (on the part of the parishioners) without reasons. It disallowed unacceptableness to the people as a disqualification. It refused to the presbytery the power of giving effect, in any instance, to the popular opposition, simply as such, no matter how general, or how strong that opposition might be. That which the Veto Law had said should be done in every case, (viz., allow the people to profess *disinclination* merely,) this Bill said should be done in none. It left the judgment of the House of Lords, in the Auchterarder case, untouched; and it afforded no protection whatever against such aggressions on the part of the Court of Session, as it had recently committed."

This could not be accepted as a measure of *relief*;—it left things just as they were; on the ground of a bill such as this, the Court of Session would have set no bounds to its proceedings in reducing the Church to a state of silent impotency.

Dr. Chalmers and his friends were slow in admitting the belief that the intention of those with whom they had to do was really such as the event shewed it to have been; and that this intention had been deliberately formed from the first. Individually and personally, these public men were honourable and trustworthy, and were well inclined to allow the slave whatever might enable

him to do his drudgery: everything in short, but—treat him as a man. They did not know, having none themselves, that men have souls; they did not know that a soul-fraught religious community requires, and that it should have, a treatment greatly differing from that which may safely be applied to the leathern consciences of a community that has been morally dead hundreds of years: they did not know that a body of Christian ministers which is so minded as to set about the reform of the masses of the people, and which therefore may become really *serviceable* to the state as a bulwark of order, is itself sensitive, and is principled, and is conscious of its rights, and will be mindful of its merits. These things public men did not know, nor were they able to appreciate facts so patent and so intelligible as these—that though the Church of England and the Church of Scotland are both called “Establishments,” and therefore both confess their relationship to the State, and acknowledge themselves to owe peculiar submission to it, the two stand in a position of absolute contrast, in every other respect. The one acknowledging the royal supremacy—the other religiously denying it; the one not to be feared, because its splendid prizes, and its shining honours, are all in the gift of the Crown, and of the minister; the other to be feared, humble in its position as it is, and commingled with the lay element, only when it is aggrieved, or has been maddened by the violence of a bigot Government, or when it is outraged, as in this instance, by a Government without soul or feeling. These public men did not know that, though the one Church, aristocratic as it is, and opulent, and inflated with undefined pretensions, demands a jealous eye to keep the implements of spiritual despotism far out of the reach of its St. Dunstons, and St. Becketts, the other Church, from which the national aristocracy has almost severed itself—which has no free revenues at its command—which has no bribes for lofty ambition—which has no pomps of worship by aid of which to awe the multitude, and the machinery of which moves upon the sluggish broad wheels of the “Eldership”—that such a Church need not be jealously watched. Truly a paltry act of tyranny it was, to come in upon the homely folk of a Scotch parish, to whom the Sunday sermon and its accompaniments, its minister and its ministrations, are the chief matters of the week, and to say—“we can’t afford to let you have the man you like: you must take the man we send you, and be thankful—like him or not. If you don’t like him now, you must learn to like him.

At any rate the patron has not a better article for you in his bag.”

The men who did all this needless wrong would not have sent Claverhouse and his troopers to scour the hills of Scotland, for this would not have suited the taste of the times; but what they did was, in every high sense, as great an enormity, and as unwarrantable a cruelty. And how impolitic was it! A Government only moderately wise would better have calculated its own interests, at that critical moment. The population of Scotland (as of England) in its dense centres, was then (as now) in a condition which statesmen looked at with dismay, and philanthropists with anguish. There was nothing of political catastrophe that was then improbable. Yet, at length, a remedial energy had sprung up in Scotland, and was coming into contact with the depraved and debauched million. The life which had lately returned to the Church, instead of wasting itself, as heretofore so often it had done, among ecclesiastical or theological controversies, had turned itself, in genuine Christian style, to its proper office. The Church was minded, and was quite willing to go down into the abyss of the popular misery, and there to carry healing for the putrefying sores of the social body. This Church wanted only a word of bidding, or only of leave:—only the hundredth part of a smile of approval from men in authority, how would it have gladdened the loyal hearts of the men who had then girded themselves for the afflictive labours of a hand-to-hand encounter with the loathsome pestilences of the people!

And under what sort of rule or guidance had this reviving Christian benevolence come at that time? This Christ-like soul, prepared to endure all things, had come under the control of a set of men, apostolic, in the sense which even a Nero might have understood and hailed as good—in this sense, namely, that they ranged themselves on the side of civil authorities, just as Paul and Peter had done; and thus, as related to the malignant turbulence of the people, they were the very men who should have been favoured, sustained, greeted, by a Government—a Government itself in peril. And of what temper was that one man who stood as the Prince of this serviceable company? A man, take him altogether, such as the world does not see, nor the Church produce, oftener than at intervals of five hundred years! Or grant it, that you may name a dozen such, looking over the entire field of church history, for eighteen centuries. Read now the twenty-first chapter of the fourth of these volumes, and there see what sort of

spirit it was, and how he stood related, specially, to the dangers and the diseases of the time then instant, which the Government of that time cast forth from the Church. A man, for the sake of whom, and of his services, and of his loyal temper, not an atom of compromise could be granted which might have retained him in his place! What!—so it is, and after this fashion is it that the wise in this world are wise! Could not so much as a corner of the Patron's usurpations be notched off just as the price of keeping a man like Thomas Chalmers in his place?

We will just say, that, while reading the chapter of this Memoir to which we have already referred, every reader who has a heart, will find heart and soul—flesh and spirit, melting into one passionate reverential ardour of affection toward this man. What a genuine “successor of the Apostles” did Scotland then see burying the blaze of a European reputation—burying it gladly, and never so happy as when thus losing himself, and quite forgetting Thomas Chalmers—busy in a tan-loft of the West Port at Edinburgh.

“A school-room was at length obtained. It lay at the end of the very close down which Burke and his associates decoyed their unconscious victims. Fronting the den in which these horrid murders were committed, stood an old deserted tannery, whose upper store-loft, approached from without by a flight of projecting wooden stairs, was selected as affording the best accommodation which the neighbourhood could supply. Low roofed and roughly floored, its raw unplastered walls, pierced at irregular intervals with windows of unshapely form, it had little either of the scholastic or the ecclesiastical in its aspect; but never was the true work of school and church done better than in that old tannery-loft of the West Port.”—Vol. iv. p. 401.

Rather than have taken any part in the cold policy of the men who could so grievously misunderstand the true interests of a Government as to drive Thomas Chalmers and his colleagues out from the Church—rather than have so done, and have done it in these enlightened times, a man might wish himself any one of those blind bigots of the middle ages, who, when all principles were misunderstood by all men, fanned the fires of Papal cruelty.

The Disruption, looked at broadly, and in the light either of our surest moral impulses, or of mere state policy, looked at in the light in which, beyond a doubt, the men of after times will regard it—the work of the men to whose pertinacity, and purblind adherence to technicalities, and to vested interests, it must be attributed—the Disrup-

tion of 1843, will for ever stand historically grouped along with those doings of bigoted governments which, though triumphantly successful at the moment, have brought upon nations centuries of terrible retribution. The parallel instances we purposely abstain from naming; for it shall not seem as if, for the purpose of adding thunder to a paragraph, we were ending it with scenes of wholesale murder. It is enough—and we are content if, with this hint, the philosophic and well-informed reader, removing from the facts attendant upon the breaking up of the Established Church of Scotland, all circumstances of an extrinsic kind, shall recognise in it, as chargeable upon the English Government at that time, those essential characteristics of FALSE WISDOM of which our own history, and still more so that of France, in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries—the seventeenth especially—afford the memorable examples.

But even when we come upon the levels of the technical question, all moral considerations dismissed, the same inference holds,—namely, that the wisdom of the public men who then broke up the Church Establishment was FALSE WISDOM. It is amazing, in reading the speeches of men like Sir Robert Peel, Lord John Russell, Lord Brougham, Lord Aberdeen, Sir James Graham, and others of less note, to find them sustaining the course they then took (and which Parliament under their guidance pursued) as toward the Evangelic majority of the Scotch Church, by aid of a sophism that is quite transparent! With the utmost confidence of tone do these statesmen rest themselves upon ground which has no support in any practice of the British Constitution. Much misunderstanding on this ground prevailed at the time in England, and perhaps still prevails—and perhaps in Scotland too—and we must yet exceed bounds a little while we do our endeavour to place the question, if not out of the reach of controversy, yet, at the least, exempt from the confusions which then enveloped it.

Do not English statesmen yet understand that the constitution of this empire, so felicitously out of joint and out of order as it is, in every limb of it, works itself forward so well as it does, over the rugged surface of all sorts of anomalies, and against them too; yes, and by the very aid of them? Who does not know this? It is a truism of English political philosophy. Then why imagine that, in the relationships (so difficult always to adjust *theoretically*) of Church and State, a bold anomaly, well and effectively provided for by due counteractions—an anomaly, an offence as it is in the lawyer's

eye, may not practically be quite safe, and be infinitely rather to be yielded to than to pursue the outrageous course of driving half a thousand right-minded and loyal clergymen out upon the bleak wolds of Dissent! and all this, that a technicality *good only in theory*, if good at all, might not by any chance get a crack!

If it be said, "No, it was not for the sake of any such lawyer's prudery that we broke up the Scotch Establishment; but for the preservation of the sacred rights of the patron;" if this be said, let it be said, and then there is an end of all argument on the subject. But in truth we think better of the men who then were so sadly prodigal of the goods of the empire, and who, in a season of spiritual famine, burned the wheat, and stored the twitch and the chaff in the national garner! We cannot, we will not, so think of Sir Robert Peel; and as to the motives of the living, we speak not of them.

The question as to the intrusion of the patron's presentee upon remonstrant congregations had, in 1842, or even earlier, ceased to stand as the *foremost* grievance of which the Church had to complain; for the course that had been so steadily pursued by the Court of Session, in setting aside the Acts of the Assembly, and in interdicting its procedures of every sort, had convinced the leading men—Dr. Chalmers and the most intelligent of his colleagues—that a resolution had been come to by the civil authorities, secure as they were now of the support of the English government, not merely to enforce law in the manner most obnoxious to the feelings of the people, and the most insulting to their ministers, but to hunt the clergy down vindictively, and to rob them of their already acquired popular influence, as high-minded men, by bringing them into the dirt. The battle, therefore, was *now* not so much for the people's liberties, in the choice of their ministers, as for the INDEPENDENCE of the CHURCH as a spiritual community—a community having a conscience of its own to satisfy, and principles of its own to maintain, and a history of its own to remember, and duties of its own to discharge.

"Yes, but if this be the question between the Church of Scotland and the State—if you are aiming to set up a spiritual despotism, and if you are intending that we should tolerate co-ordinate authorities, you must be content to take our answer at once—we can do no such thing."

And why might not co-ordinate authorities be recognised in this instance, since a hundred such are embraced in the composition

of the British political system? And why may not a spiritual despotism—if, indeed, you choose to employ that offensive phrase, why may it not be tolerated in this case, as in fifty others, which the State has learned to look down upon with absolute indifference? A free country, a country in which religious toleration is complete, offers precisely the field whereupon, without danger, either of trouble to the State, or of invasion of the rights of the people, Spiritual Despotisms, balancing one another, and all neutralized, as to their noxious properties, by the overwhelming omnipotence of public opinion, may not merely be admitted, but may be regarded complacently, by the philosophic statesman, as engines efficient for their special purposes, and which never can be efficient, except so far as they *are*, in a sense, despotic—that is to say, have an inherent power, and a tendency too, to outstep their proper limits.

A village-reading society, consisting of a dozen members, of which the rector and the squire, hand and glove, are secretary and treasurer, is a spiritual despotism; and it may, in fact, do, and often does, very unkind things. Nay, it is an authority *co-ordinate* with the "Estates of the Realm, in Parliament assembled." And it actually stands contemporaneously confronting the High Court of Chancery, wielding independent powers! And so assuredly is the "North-eastern division of the county of * * * * * Particular-Baptist-Ministerial-Association," a spiritual despotism; and in right Philpott style, may it, as in awful synod constituted, overstep reason and charity, toward any of its members. Nevertheless, and even while the state is harbouring scores of such "Holy Offices," and is winking at their doings, things do go on among us tolerably well; for, as to *indefinite wrongs*, inflicted upon individuals, by any of these tyrannic corporations, public opinion on the one hand, comes in to curb the wrong doers, and on the other hand, it avenges, in most cases, the cause of the sufferers. Meantime, as to any *definite wrong*—a jury will see to it. Nevertheless, it is fully granted that, when we leave the fen-country, and come to tread the loftier tablelands of the social system, caution is needed, if we are called upon to recognise, or to give place to, a spiritual despotism. In *that* case, we ought to know something of our customer; and we should be sure that he is not one who, if we give him an inch, will take an ell, and who, if we allow him to build a factory on the sea-shore, will not soon be found to build a fortress inland. A government, therefore, is not to be blamed

that thinks twice, and makes some inquiries, before it recognises a co-ordinate authority, and grants space to a spiritual despotism, which already holds in its hand the means of intimidating a government.

Thus, then, and on this ground, we could not blame the English Government if, at the time of the religious resuscitation which has lately affected the Church of Scotland, and the consequent advancement of a claim, on its part, to be reinstated in its true ecclesiastical position, the whole question of what that claim involves, or what it might bring in its train, was very narrowly looked into. This was quite proper; but then two things should have recommended this justifiable course of caution;—namely, *first*, that the genuine merits of the question—historically and legally considered, should have been fully understood—ENGLISH NOTIONS APART; and, *secondly*, that this caution as toward one state client, should not have been belied by an abeyance of all caution, at the same time, in an instance which demanded ten-fold more. Yet so it was, that, while nothing could be granted to the Church of Scotland, and while little heed was given to its reasonable pleas—Popery was truckled to, and was allowed to dictate the terms on which it would sustain ministers in Parliament! It is abundantly certain that, when a power or a corporation claims for itself the exercise of an independent authority—when it asks leave to set up, along side of the civil authority, another authority related to it by no right of appeal from the one to the other, the utmost caution should be used. And what folly is chargeable upon those who use absolutely none, when they have to do with a power which keeps faith with none, which has no conscience, which spurns the control of public opinion, which owns subjection to a lawless foreign Potentate, and which, if anything more be needed, obtrudes its head among us, dripping with the cruelties of millions of murders, and haggard with the debaucheries of a thousand years!—Always ambitious, always sanguinary, and always false.

But we turn to the state of the case, as to those pleas, on the ground of which it was thought to be wise, good, and unavoidable, to break up the Scotch Establishment. It was said—"It is monstrous to come to us, and ask Parliament to grant to the ecclesiastical courts, in Scotland, an authority co-ordinate with the Civil Courts—the Court of Session; or to allow to those Church Courts a jurisdiction of any sort, from which there should be no appeal to the Civil Judicature. Be sure this is what we will never do."

But how does this plea hold, either with

fact, or with the axioms of a Free State? It holds with neither.

Not with any such axioms. The principle of absolute centralization—that is to say, of the subordination of all authorities, down to the very lowest, and the consequent right and custom of appeal, upward and upward still, from the lowest to the highest, has scarcely been carried out, even in Oriental despotisms, or in Turkey or Russia. As to constitutional and free states, NON-CENTRALIZATION is their reason, their life, their glory. From the energies of co-ordinate powers, indirectly, but not directly related one to the other, free states draw their vital heat and their expansive force. In free states, it is from the invisible interaction and non-parliamentary counterpoise, of independent bodies and interests—it is from the *virtual*, and not the *legal* right of appeal, carried over from one body to another, that the community derives, at once, its onward momentum, and its interior harmony. Masses moving with high velocities, in one and the same direction, move safely, so long as they are not rigidly bolted, one to the other. All goes smooth and noiseless, if you will but leave them alone; but if busy M.Ps., with a lawyer or two among them, set to work to screw things tight, all bursts asunder.

In virtue of what quality is it that Christianity adapts itself so well to the manners, feelings, and institutions of a free people, and how is it that, as fixedly lodged in the convictions of the people, it becomes the guarantee of their political, as well as of their religious liberty? It is just thus, that Christianity, when deeply felt to be true, and when bowed to as an ultimate rule of conduct, is—and will be—and peremptorily insists upon its right to be regarded as, an authority *independent of every other*, anterior to every other, and so, when once it has come to be embodied in institutions of its own, it stands as CO-ORDINATE with the secular authority: it is thus that Christianity acts as the guardian of civil liberty. Despotisms have never comprehended this truth. The papacy has misinterpreted it. Constitutional Protestant governments have understood it more or less clearly; and after many struggles, and while clearing their way, *empirically*, through many perplexities, they have reached in *practice*, if not in *theory*, some workable solutions of the problem which this same co-ordination involves. These Protestant solutions of this problem have rested on very different, or even on antagonistic grounds; and yet, in practice, the *result* has been nearly the same, so long as there has been, on the part of governments, discretion enough, temper enough, intelligence enough,

to manage among, and between, these several solutions, and to avoid the bringing them into collision with each other, or with itself. A strange want of intelligence among the statesmen of 1843, as to the first principle of the Scotch, as opposed to the English Church, together with the ordinary lack of that temper and discretion which a *right feeling* supplies, hurried the government on in a course which rendered the Disruption inevitable. In one word, four hundred and seventy clergymen were cruelly driven from their benefices, nine years ago, just because English statesmen could not be made to understand that the PROTESTANT PROBLEM of the co-ordination of the secular and the spiritual in a free state, had been solved in *one manner* in England, and in another manner in Scotland; nor that the one mode of solution is as safe and as practicable as the other, if not altogether as good.

The legal circumstance of a Church being established, or non-established, conglomerate with the State, or only tolerated under, and recognised by it, does not touch the question of granting to it an independent functional existence, and of allowing it to exercise a co-ordinate authority. Or, so far as this circumstance does, or may affect the question, it does so, by at once enhancing the motives which should impel the secular power to allow this independent action, and by putting into its hands the easy means of applying a check should it be needed.

In this country, non-established religious bodies—some of them despotic enough in their interior constitution, and some of them holding the means to touch men's secular interests, very nearly, do exist in perfect consistency with the public tranquillity, and ordinarily with the safety of the people individually. We live in the very midst of co-ordinations innumerable. Yes, but our legal adversary will say—"every one of these independent bodies or hierarchies is liable to be called before civil courts, there to give account of its doing; and there to be made to feel that there is power seated over its head." No, we say, never is one of these independent authorities dragged by appellation from its sphere, or called to account, unless it has itself, by some overt act, stepped out beyond its limits. A very little over-stepping of its boundary line, as understood by the world around them, brings any of these transgressing bodies under the eye and lash of public opinion; and in most instances all is soon set right: if not—if this community persists in planting itself outside its enclosure, an appeal to the civil power, in the course either of law or equity, as the case may require, presently sets things

straight, and we go on again smoothly—until next time. Independent authorities, within a free state, may blaze away, and shew all sorts of portentous colours in the sky, as harmlessly as the aurora borealis, so long as they keep to their proper ideal; and so long as they hold no correspondence with foreign influences.

When we come to deal with Protestant Churches, as *national*, or *established*, and as, therefore, carrying more momentum in the social system, and as more nearly amenable to the secular authority, we are not to suppose that we *can* (or that there is in fact any motive for wishing to do so) cashier such a Church of its intrinsic independence, or strip it of its functional co-ordinate authority. We *cannot* do it; for a Church which should be subjected to any such violence would cease to be a Church. Then, there is no motive for attempting it; for a body of men, thus treated, within a community that is itself free and spontaneous, must quickly cease to be serviceable to the State in any way. These degraded men will not earn their wages: they will hang about a government as a millstone. A government, wise indeed, will desire to connect itself, constitutionally, with a Church which has some life in itself, which can stand on its legs without propping, which has a head and a heart of its own. A despotic government dares not marry itself to a bride of this high bearing; but a free State may safely do so; and with high advantage may do it.

We come then to the two Protestant modes of solving the problem, the first condition of which is this, that Christianity, *undamaged in its vitality*, shall so be constituted in immediate connexion with the State, as may enable it to render the maximum of service to the community, in the mode of an endowed territorial scheme of popular instruction. As a spiritual existence, anterior to any such compact and combination, possessed of powers of its own, which are unalienable, it must be regarded by the State at the first; and so must it be treated with, continuously. We can have no argument with any who will not grant so much as this—for such men, profess what they may, are infidels; or if not infidels, it is only because they know absolutely nothing about Christianity itself.

The *second*—and the perplexing condition of our problem is this—that Christianity, thus visibly established, and placed in amicable contiguity with the State, should bring its unalienable independent authority into a working harmony with the State, so as that, though it be co-ordinate, collisions, and an actual antagonism, may be avoided.

A short cut to a solution of this difficulty seems to be offered, when it is said—"let the State look to, control, and dispose of, all things secular; and let the Church concern itself with, and supremely control all things spiritual." Yet before we can avail ourselves of this obvious distinction, we must subjoin some explanations; and here it is that the misunderstanding between England and Scotland first meets us in a definite form. The term "spiritual," easily gives place to the ambiguous term "ecclesiastical," and to this word, ideas widely different attach in England and in Scotland. In the latter, the two words are much more nearly convertible than they are in the former. When Englishmen hear of "Church Courts" in Scotland, as having *final* control over "ecclesiastical matters," and claiming to give judgment thereupon without room of appeal, they take alarm, thinking of this lofty pretension as if it included the disposal of benefices, stipends, manes, glebes, revenues, and palpable goods and interests, anent the Church. John Bull gruffly says—"this will never do." No, it will not do as *you* understand it; but the Church Courts in Scotland, when they claim final action in matters *ecclesiastical*, are thinking only of matters that are purely spiritual, or, let us say, entirely *religious*, and they have *in fact* carefully held themselves back from interference with "temporalities;" when, for instance, they have refused to ordain the Patron's presentee, they have let the benefice in question go adrift. Just on the ground of this misunderstanding of the technical meaning of a word, has the conduct of those who broke away from the Establishment been utterly misunderstood in England, and heedlessly condemned by many.

But the main point of the difference between the Church of England, and the Presbyterian Church (all sections of it, in Scotland) is this:—The Church of England acknowledges, and professes openly, and yields itself to, the ROYAL SUPREMACY. The Church of Scotland not merely refuses to acknowledge this Supremacy, but it professes, as a fundamental article of its faith, what it calls "the Headship of Christ"—a headship, the recognition of which it understands to be irreconcilable with the Royal, or with any analogous Supremacy. Now this characteristic doctrine is not a bare abstraction, for it means something that is applicable to Church Government; it has, and it demands to have, an interpretation practically affecting the discipline, and the working of the Church. Especially it demands to be considered when questions arise touching the relationship of the Church to the State.

It would carry us beyond all bounds, and

lead us far remote from our proper subject, if we were to attempt to set forth, in the way of a comparison, that scheme, highly complicated as it is, on the ground of which the Church of England relates itself to the State—while acknowledging the Royal Supremacy, and yet holding to, and maintaining its intrinsic powers as a Church—whether established or not established. On this wide field we must not here set a foot. But it is manifest that, when men who have been trained under, and whose minds are occupied with, the English Church-and-State system—the Royal Supremacy *included*, come to take in hand the Scottish Church-and-State system—the Royal Supremacy *excluded*, and peremptorily denied, they are almost certain to misjudge the matters before them, and to *go* wrong, and to *do* wrong, grievously. So was it at the time of the Disruption, and during the preceding seven years, in which the usurpations, encroachments, and violences of the Court of Session were winked at, or abetted, by the English Government. It was moreover on the ground of those same mis-apprehensions that the Free Church movement came to be regarded suspiciously in England, by many whose sympathies, as Christian men, would otherwise have carried them warmly over to that side of the Disruption controversy. Chalmers, and his band of sufferers for the truth's sake, will however come to stand right, ere long, on the page of Church history.

But let it well be noted that, whatever of practical inference, in an ecclesiastical sense, belonged to the dogma of the Headship of Christ, as professed by the Presbyterian Church—that dogma, and the inferences it carried, were openly, and even loudly professed, at the time when the State allied itself to that Church; and that, throughout the course of three centuries it—the Presbyterian Church—has held to the same profession, and has protested against all infringement of it; and, when these infringements were accompanied with violence, it has suffered, *precisely* in bearing testimony to this, its fundamental dogma. The blood of eighteen thousand martyrs, shed within the compass of a few years, sealed this solemn testimony.

At the moment when the Church and the State met in conference, to adjust the terms of an alliance, the doctrine of the "Headship of Christ" was not merely written upon the hearts of the Presbyterian ministers; was not merely graven upon the palms of their hands; but it was inscribed in letters of gold upon their banners. All men read those words; all men knew what they meant. And what did they mean? The

Church has interpreted them with an elaborate perspicuity of phrase. It says—Christ, the only Head of the Church, has founded, and has specified (it is not a question now in hand whether *we* think so, or not) a form of Government for it, by ministers, and lay elders, duly appointed, and acting in Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, and which, when thus acting or speaking, does so in the name of Christ, as Head of the Church, and with His sanction and authority. This Church, thus constituted, and so acting, and while confining itself within its province—that is to say, while concerning itself only with matters purely spiritual—religious—must be, and is, whether allied to the State or not—exempt from all interference or control, on the part of the secular authority. The Church, so constituted, and so acting, is, and must be, so long as it keeps to its own ground—an authority independent of every other, and competent to take final action in causes spiritual, without room of appeal to any other judicatory.

We come then to the very core of the question. The Church is not an abstraction, floating in men's minds; but it is an INSTITUTION—visible in itself, and visibly planted upon, and in, and among, the things of this world. How earnestly soever it might wish to hold itself off from all contact with the things of this earth, it cannot do so. When carrying out its proper functions, as a spiritual power, and when acting in the most cautious, unambitious, and abstinent manner, its decisions often do, and inevitably must sometimes, touch—remotely, or directly, the interests, properties, reputation of individuals, as citizens. Human ingenuity has not hitherto, and we confidently say never will, succeed in devising means that shall entirely evade this perplexing incidental consequence of the existence of Visible Christianity in a free country. The most obscure and powerless of our religious sects is as much entangled in this difficulty, as is the most powerful.

What then are the ways out? There are several. The first is to declare the Church to be supreme, as well in things secular, as in things sacred. This is the Papacy, and it solves the problem neatly; benefices or kingdoms—glebes or empires—are, on this principle disposed of in the readiest manner. Another way out of the difficulty is that taken by secular despotisms, such as that which our Harry the Eighth sought to establish, and which, in the same style of simplicity and of unembarrassed promptitude, makes itself the judge of doctrine—creates Churchmen—orders ceremonies—disposes of ecclesiastical interests, summarily, and with-

out appeal. Extensively modified, chiefly by the course of events, but also by acts of the legislature, by the progress of opinion, and at length by the substitution in the Church itself, of a proper Church-feeling, in the place of the utter secularity of the last century, this has worked itself into the complicated and equipoised system of the English Church-and-State machinery, crowned and knit together by the Royal Supremacy. Whatever objections, *in theory*, this scheme may be open to, *in practice* it consists well with the movements and with the spirit of English civil Institutions: and it is, for the most part, cordially approved of by the best informed classes of the English people. At this time there is no wish (general) to see anything put in the place of the Royal Supremacy. On the contrary, the people have lately learned to look toward the throne with a religious feeling of comfort, security, and hopefulness. So may it be, years many to come.

There is, however, another, (and the temper of the people of Scotland considered) a better and a more simple contrivance, by aid of which the perplexities that are *inseparable* from the co-existence of Christianity in a free state—may be reduced to a minimum, and may, in practice, if not in theory, be disregarded as evils exceptional, and of rare occurrence. In fact, this simpler scheme *has* worked well throughout all those periods of Scotch history in which Scotland has stood exempt from English cupidity, or bigotry. Mischief and confusion have come on, just as often as the restlessness of the English Church and Government has sought to overturn it; and of all these instances of mischievous meddling, this last with which we are now concerned, is the most egregious, when law lords in Parliament, carrying with them the Government, (men in and out of office,) thought it good to ignore the first principle of the Presbyterian Church, and to stretch over SCOTLAND the iron frame-work of the ENGLISH Church-and-State scheme!

The Church of Scotland, when left to act on its own principle, (of course we are going back to times gone by,) concerns itself with all matters of doctrine, worship, discipline, and religious movement, in a sovereign manner, appeal lying from the lower Church courts to the higher—the highest—namely, the General Assembly, the findings and enactments of which are final. But then, as often as such decisions, touching, for instance, the ordination or the location of ministers, carry with them consequences involving the temporalities of the Church—as, for instance, the enjoyment of stipends, manses, glebes, or the like—the Church recedes from inter-

ference, leaving Cæsar to do what he wills with his own.

This, we say, is a straightforward course. It does not, indeed—for that *in the nature of the case is beyond possibility*—remove all difficulties out of the way; but it leaves them, when they arise, in a position in which they may be dealt with, as thus:—We will assume nothing more chimerical than this, that the secular authority, speaking by the civil courts, fully understanding the principle of the Church with which it stands connected, and wisely alive to the importance of the function which this Church discharges toward the community, is always well disposed to fall in with, and to second its decisions, as far as it can do so—that it is wholly disinclined to attempt encroachments of any sort, that it is inflamed by no sectarian or vindictive purposes, and that it is not infidel at heart. In a word, we ask nothing more hypothetical than this—that the Church should find itself in alliance with a secular power, *national* in its feeling, and which, in all points, should be the very contrary of what it had to do with in the years immediately preceding the Disruption.

Now, in a state of things such as we here imagine, there is, on the side of the Church, a distinct and ever present recollection of the fact that, although its own acts cannot be over-ruled from without, and although no appeal lies from the General Assembly, these acts, if intemperate or unwarrantable, will *effectively* come under revision when the palpable interests therein touched are disposed of by another Court. This recollection will, for the most part, furnish a check quite adequate to the occasions when it may be needed. On the other side, the civil authority, with its right feeling toward the Church, and its natural solicitude for the avoidance of scandals and of irritation, is little likely to run things upon the rocks without some obvious necessity. Thus the two powers, co-ordinate though they be, and each supreme on its own ground, are held in harmony of action by a silent consciousness toward each other, a consciousness not collusive and not jealous, not quick to take offence, or captious; and yet observant and awake.

Yet this is not all, for that harmony of action which we are thus supposing to be possible, is further secured by other concurrent influences. So long as the Church Courts and the Court of Session should be known to be governed by a reciprocal feeling, appellants, whether they were rejected presentees, or thwarted patrons, or delinquent members, would understand their chances of success better than to carry their

wrongs from the one court to the other, except in cases in which they might securely rely upon the support of public opinion. If we imagine a case of flagrant oppression, on the part, first of the General Assembly, and then as followed up collusively by the Court of Session, the wronged man might reckon upon it as certain that he held in his hands the means of bringing public opinion down upon both authorities in a formidable manner. Thus, by this silent inter-relationship of three bodies—the ecclesiastical, the civil, and the popular—so much harmony, or so much avoidance of serious mischiefs, is secured, as ought at all to be looked for in the adjustments of the social system, ever perplexing and precarious as they are. Do we not know that, just in proportion as such a system embraces powers, functions, influences, of the highest quality, and of inestimable value, these adjustments are difficult to be effected, are often inconclusive, and are liable to mischances.

Bold are the men who walk across a border, from one country to another, frivolously intending to tamper with institutions which, whether better or worse, abstractedly, are deep rooted in the convictions of the people—consist well with their habits of thinking and feeling, and which have come down to them commended to their care by the dying injunctions of an army of martyrs! Yet, such courage—such reckless temerity rather, inflated the minds of those English Statesmen, who drove the Disruption forward. For the history, in detail, of this outrage, every reader will turn to Dr. Hanna's clear, temperate, and very impressive narrative, as presented in the fourth volume of these Memoirs. A memorable history, indeed, and one which will go down to another time as fraught with instruction, if not more momentous in itself, yet more pertinent, as related to coming events, than any other which the page of church history offers to our perusal.

We return, for a moment, to our immediate subject, namely, the course of Dr. Chalmers, as a public man. Scarcely can we imagine anything of the kind more painful—more depressing, in a moral sense, than would have been the perusal of this fourth volume of these Memoirs, if the facts which were to occupy its pages had been the converse of what they are; or if, to say all in a word, the anticipations of those who thought themselves quite safe, when they estimated other men's virtue by what they knew of their own, had been realized in that hour of trial—the 18th of May, 1843. "Mark my words," said one of the wise, at that time, "not forty of them will go out."

"If Government is firm," said another, "I venture, upon pretty accurate information, to assert that less than one hundred will cover the whole secession." "But I am not satisfied that *any* will secede." Let us now imagine it to have been so, in fact, and that this man of power, (we are saying nothing just now of his worthy colleagues and like-minded adherents,) whom we have followed in affectionate admiration up to his sixty-third year, *hitherto* always bold for the truth, always oblivious of himself, and who had pledged himself to adhere to, and to maintain, a great principle, had, at the last, quailed—had stuck to "good things," and had employed his residue of days in fudging up apologies for this treason! We need not ask what sort of MEMOIR this, which we have now before us, would then have been, for it never would have been written at all;—those who thus had lost their Father and their Guide, *could not* have written any such disastrous history; and those who, in any such manner, had gained him, would have looked with dismay upon their victim, and would have been only too happy, if they could have hid their own shame, and his, in an eternal oblivion!

Yet, it is a part only of the whole case, and the smaller part, too, which we take into the account, when thus we imagine, as possible, what would have been so disastrous had it occurred.

The reader of these instructive and animating volumes will have followed a man of the rarest mental and moral qualities, through that long and triumphant course of preaching, teaching, writing, and personal administration of Church affairs, the end and upshot of which was—to resuscitate his country, and to impart to its admitted belief—a long lost vitality. Chalmers will take his place, in the eyes of posterity, as the restorer of evangelic feeling in Scotland. But now one cannot—stretching candour to the utmost, think of the reckless course pursued by the civil courts, and abetted by the English Government, during the ten years preceding the Disruption, otherwise than that the drift and purport of this policy was—not so much to save the endangered interests of patrons, as to put down—to quash—to discourage, that evangelical revival of which Chalmers was the prime mover. To turn the men of the evangelical party clean out of the Church was not intended or wished for; but only to disgrace them in the eyes of the people, and so to destroy their growing influence, and to check the spread of their opinions. In *this* respect, therefore, the policy of the Government toward Scotland differed from that which had

prompted the Act of Uniformity; for the Government of that time, Church-ridden, intended nothing else than to sweep the Church clean of Puritanism, by the expulsion of every one of the Puritan ministers. In this modern instance no such result was calculated upon as that which actually ensued. What was thought to be probable—so we must suppose, was this, that after some few of the leaders—for their honours' sake, had resigned their benefices and their chairs, the great body of the evangelical ministers—becoming wise in time, would hold their livings, and when thus deprived of their leaders, would cower down before the Court of Session, would lose for ever their influence with the people, would dwindle away; and so, if the party had not become extinct, it would have ceased to command a majority in the Assembly. That is to say, Moderatism would have recovered its ascendancy there, the kindly slumbers of the good old times gone by, would have returned upon Scotland: patrons and presentees would have ceased to be troubled by the popular voice: the Court of Session would have become courteous and compliant, and all would again have been right.

These anticipations—ill-founded as they had been, fell through, in fact; Chalmers, and his friends, and the men whom he had trained, amazed the prophets—lay and clerical; but satisfied the expectations of those who had better understood him, and them; and thus it is that he takes his place—a front place—among the venerated worthies of all time.

But we say, if he and his adherents had otherwise acted, not merely would so illustrious an example have been lost to the world, but the Christianity which so long he had laboured to restore to his country, must have sustained an overthrow, perhaps irrecoverable. In what way the Disruption told, at the time, and is likely henceforward to tell, upon the religious well-being of Scotland—evangelically considered, this is not the place to inquire. So far, however, as any such inquiry may seem to receive light from Dr. Chalmers's recorded opinions, our proposed review of his Works, in a future Article, may afford a not unfit opportunity to take it up. Meantime, from this important subject, along with several others, suggested by the volumes before us, we must at present abstain.

Scotland—we say nothing now of England, and all the world beside—Scotland will read these Memoirs with (pride is not the word) a glow of pleasurable exultation, which, as she admits it, will give force and

depth to the lessons they convey ; and these lessons are such that a people duly heeding them, and giving them effect in its institutions, and bringing them to bear upon its temper and habits, and its modes of thinking, would make itself a pattern to all nations, specially of that fervour without acerbity, of that intensity without fanatical exaggeration, of that zeal for great truths without bigotry, and of that benevolent Christian laboriousness, as toward the masses of the people, of which THOMAS CHALMERS was the bright and shining example.

Perfectly sure as we are that our readers, every one of them, will look to the volumes themselves, rather than to these pages, for whatever relates to the personal history, and to the individuality of Dr. Chalmers, we have held to those points which touch his course as the PRINCIPAL PERSON, religiously, of his time ; and, especially, as the Leader and soul of that course of events which issued in the establishment of the Free Church, and so, in the present ecclesiastical partitionment of Scotland. It is as connected with this great movement (in our opinion) that his name will take a foremost place in the religious history of this current century. In professing so to think, we do not involve ourselves in any questionable surmises, as to what, to use a secular phrase, may be called the "future fortunes" of the FREE CHURCH. In truth, as to this futurity, we are quite disinclined to risk any conjecture whatever. And that for several reasons—such, for example, as these ; that a course of events which must hinge upon a thousand contingencies—each of them incalculable, is very likely to disappoint even the most probable conjectures ; that, personally, we yet need a mass of various evidence bearing upon the subject, and prerequisite to the formation of any such predictive opinion ; and, conclusively—that the utterance of an opinion of this kind would not tend to promote any desirable end.

What is far more safe, and more likely to be serviceable is, in a word or two, to note those two or three religious and ecclesiastical problems to which, in the Disruption movement, a marked prominence was given ; or which received, in the course and issue of it, a solution, more or less complete. In attempting so to specify these problems, one is moved to introduce a name fitting to stand by the side of CHALMERS—the name of ARNOLD. An attempted comparison between men every way so dissimilar, would be a failure ; they were not men of the same order, or of the same intel-

tual genius : both, indeed, were such that, in modern times, Scotland has only one to boast of, and England only one : both were men whose minds, by structure, always took in and grasped the widest aspect of the things with which they concerned themselves : both lost, in the presence of those things, all thought of selfish ends ; both were morally prepared to do, and to dare, any work they should be called to undertake : both, with deep throes of the soul, revolved the conditions of the social system, and pondered the remedial means that should be used. But, as ARNOLD was incomparably the more accomplished man of the two, Chalmers had more in him of the statesman, and more of practical force, and of appliant energy ; and he must, we think, be regarded as, in a Christian sense, the more advanced man of the two. But the point of contrast just now before us is this, that, while ARNOLD started several great problems—leaving them as he found them, unsolved, Chalmers brought the questions he touched a stage or two forward, if he did not actually bring them on to a conclusion.

The first of these problems, and the one which we hold to have been conclusively resolved in the course of events ending in the Disruption, is that, the CONCLUSION of which may thus be given :—That Scotland should never again look to Parliament, or to an English Government, as if expecting from either any enactments, or any course of proceeding touching its religious welfare, which shall truly meet its interests, or which shall, in any enlightened and liberal manner, do it good. Scotland must henceforward look to itself ; that is to say, must bring itself and its parties, and its population, into a state of preparedness for measures which, when thus the country is ripe for them, it may apply for in a tone which no Government will dare to misunderstand. Parliament never does understand things that are a long way off ; nor is it easily persuaded to hold itself together, for an evening, forty-strong, while *distant* interests are explained and pleaded for. How hard a matter has it been, often, to get or to keep a House, for the affairs of India, or of Canada, or of Ireland, unless indeed when the Ministry and the opposition were joining issue upon some single question. But as to Scotland, and the religious welfare of its people, every chance is against it ! Its own aristocracy has long been alienated from that wellbeing, and is Episcopal, so far almost as it is religiously minded at all ; its *true* wellbeing involves much that is obnoxious to English tastes, and, worst of all,

no ecclesiastical questions, purely and properly Scotch, can be cut off from their bearing upon questions relating to which the English ecclesiastical feeling is intensely sensitive and jealous.

The Free Church part of our readers, or some of them, will say,—“We care nothing for Parliament, or for Government, as related to our religious welfare: we have done with Establishments, with Parliaments, and with Sir Robert—and Sir James—and Lord John—and their successors for ever.” We reply,—so you may think, just at this time; but it is not certain that *your successors* may not come to such a mind, as to what is, or would be, best for Scotland, as would lead them—not again—this will never be—to petition, and to crave attention, and to invite interviews, and to besiege the residences of Statesmen; but to make known the wants and wishes of Scotland, in peremptory terms, and to get them sanctioned and carried out by Parliament.

A great problem, which was brought forward by Dr. Chalmers, and carried on under his auspices, a stage or two toward a conclusion; but *not* concluded, was that of NATIONAL ESTABLISHMENTS;—to wit, the abstract desirableness of these institutions or their necessity, and the conditions under which they may be so framed as to consist with the Independence of the Church, and with a perfect development of individual civil liberty. We do not forget the fact that there are those who will triumphantly appeal to the Disruption, and to the founding of the Free Church, as affording evidence more than sufficient to outweigh whatever Dr. Chalmers himself, or others may have said in favour of the Church and State principle. Let this be thought by those who can so interpret the facts. We can ourselves imagine a course of events, as not impossible, which would turn the scale decisively on the other side, and thus bring to bear upon the question, with a new force, whatever he had written and uttered, thereto relating, at an earlier period. A course of events tending toward this issue, would not, or need not be, of a sort disastrous for the Free Church: the contrary rather. Let that Church extend itself continually; let it realize, more and more completely, Dr. Chalmers's own idea of a complete territorial occupation of the country; let it bring itself into frontage, if we may so speak, with the population of Scotland, and let it measure itself and its means, more statistically, against the unreclaimed thousands or millions of the people; and when it has done so, two results will then come into view—namely, *first*, the immense insufficiency of any means, and of all

imaginable enlargements of such means, which the spontaneous zeal of the christianized portion of a community can furnish for christianizing the unchristian portion. Wonders have been effected *upon spots* by such means; and wonders have been done over wide surfaces *on extraordinary occasions*; nor need we look further than into the pages of these Memoirs for such instances, worthy of all admiration and imitation as they are. But neither these instances, nor any other, touch the great argument involved in the problem, How shall the masses of the people, already vitiated in the last degree, be brought under a systematic and effective and permanent process of religious instruction and discipline? Say—“by the efforts of spontaneous zeal:” yes, when Christianity has already possessed itself of the social system, in a manner of which hitherto we can cite no examples.

If now we imagine the Free Church to prosper, and to be setting the stakes of its tabernacle further and further outward every year, it will, as we think, while doing so, only convince itself the more of the vast and immeasurable inadequacy of its utmost powers of overtaking the work before it. A spontaneous Christian machinery grows, as related to a dense manufacturing population, at the rate of an arithmetical progression; but the vice, ignorance, and misery of that population—to the fuller knowledge of which it is coming, swells and spreads at the rate of a geometrical progression. Thus thinking, we take Dr. Chalmers's early and powerful advocacy of National Establishments in the one hand, and in the other, the history of the Disruption, and the entire mass of facts attaching to the progress of the Free Church, since his death; and we hold the two in contiguity, not as if they were elements, contradicting and counter-acting each other, but as elements of a problem *which is still in progress toward a genuine conclusion*;—that conclusion not unlikely to be of the sort we are supposing, whether the Free Church prospers or declines.

But again. We are most willing to imagine, not only that the Free Church shall prosper, and shall spread itself over the land; but that the Church Established shall hold its own ground, and that, instead of becoming more and more secularized, as might have seemed probable, it shall at once disappoint the anticipations of its opponents, and thwart the views and purposes of its false friends, and that it shall, in good measure, partake of every better influence around it, and thus hold on, and go on, abreast of its sister community. Besides this, we are wil-

ling to suppose that each of the Dissenting or separate (orthodox) communions shall also hold its own, and shall win ample conquests from the wilds of impiety around it. Now, as the consequence of this state of things—and which is the best and the happiest we can picture to ourselves as probable—there would still present itself, not perhaps before our own old eyes—too long used as they have been to look indifferently upon such things—but to the young and undamaged eyes of our successors, that Enormity of our modern Christianity—that damning sin of Protestantism—that source, direct, of the perdition of the lost millions anear us—that inestimable prodigality which squanders the Infinite, and which wastes the funds of Eternity—(we will not allow that we are at all indulging in exaggeration when thus we speak of) that ill consequence of our boasted liberties, which shows itself in the overlapping of so many costly religious organizations—each Church, out of five or seven, interlacing its operations with every other—each planting itself athwart the path of every other, and each spending, *upon the very same acres*, an amount of ministerial body-and-soul power and of popular contribution, which, if it were wisely economized and carefully distributed, would suffice for reclaiming a wilderness!

It is this same reckless spontaneousness—it is this spurious product of a misunderstood conscientiousness—it is this wilful resolution to have things managed precisely in our own way—it is this opiniative egotism, sprouting itself out in wasteful committeeism, which, more than the obduracy of the heathen's soul, has stayed the course of the Missionary Work, filling our Annual Reports with sickening repetitions of vast labours, and vast expenditures, and slender results, and hopes always in the distance! So it is abroad—so it is at home—so it is that the heathen millions, at home and abroad, must wait until “you—and you—and you—and I,” can be content to see the world saved, otherwise than just to *our* taste!

Here we say is a problem, urgent, and of incalculable importance, to which Chalmers, with his large soul, just gave the inchoative impulse, but died, leaving it to be taken up and solved by the men of a better age. But how was he minded towards its solution? Just so minded was he as we might be sure such a man would be; and so minded as that, if this great question had come on to stand in a more tangible and a more advanced state, directly in his path, he would have applied his giant strength to it, in the endeavour to bring things into a condition more Christian-like and rational. On one

occasion, (after the Disruption,) with indignant vehemence, and “in the fervour of intense excitement,” he rejected the imputation of sectarian aims, and thus spoke at a public meeting held at Edinburgh,—“Who cares about the Free Church, compared with the Christian good of the people of Scotland? Who cares about any Church but as an instrument of Christian good? for, be assured, that the moral and religious well-being of this population is of infinitely higher importance than the advancement of any sect.”—Vol. iv. p. 394.

At this moment the supposition would be scouted as utterly chimerical, and fit only to amuse the meditations of a recluse, knowing nothing of mankind, that a time shall come when religious folks shall, with a sort of instantaneous and involuntary impulse, solve this above-mentioned problem in a moment, and without the help of argument or persuasion. All that is needed for bringing about so vast and desirable a result is this—that Conscience should be brought, perhaps by some accident, to take a right turn, instead of holding on to a wrong turn. We have all thought it an axiom in Christian ethics, that, in matters of religious opinion, of worship, and of discipline, we *may*, and we *must*, individually, follow our particular convictions; but let it appear, nay, let it be demonstrated before our eyes, that the practical consequence of our adhering, all round, to this mistaken supposition is, that the gospel, instead of blessing all nations, and of running and being glorified in all lands—instead of confounding infidelity by its triumphs, and absorbing impiety by its spread, is pinched in upon a few spots, and is even surrendering each advantage that it has won! When Christian men, staggered and dismayed as they look at the map of the world, shall come in seriousness to ask themselves how, and why it is, and has been so, the answer will peal as a thunder, shaking their souls:—it is so because conscience, hitherto in league with an overweening selfishness, has failed to urge upon us our duty toward our fellows—a duty which sects never do understand, and can never discharge.

The admirable sagacity and statesman-like ability which Dr. Chalmers displayed, first in devising the plan of his “Sustentation” Scheme, and then in giving effect to it—successful as this management was, operated very naturally to veil a little from his view the inherent difficulties that attach to the Fiscal Economy of a religious body. These difficulties—unless at moments of excitement, such as that of the Disruption, or when energies and intelligence quite extra-

ordinary are (as then) brought to bear upon the case—*press as a dead-weight upon all non-established Churches*; and if they do not so press upon Established Churches, it is only because exemption from that pressure has been purchased *at a cost which itself brings with it its full equivalent of perplexities*. Now this fiscal difficulty is *one* of the problems which, although in fact it was dealt with by Dr. Chalmers, stands over to a time future, to receive full and satisfactory solution.

But then the resolving of this fiscal problem must bring with it, by necessary implication, the resolution of others; such as, the true ground of the relationship between the clergy and the people—so strangely misunderstood on all sides, (we cannot except our nearest friends,) and the principle and practice of the division of ministerial labour within each Church circuit, and the Church at large.

Now, in a closing word, we incline to express the belief, that the function of CHALMERS, considered as an Ecclesiastical Person, was just this—To bring into a position the most conspicuous imaginable those great and perplexing questions which attach to the planting of Christianity, as a PALPABLE and

VISIBLE INSTITUTION, among the things of this world; harmlessly toward itself, and beneficially as toward those things. What this great man has said, written, and done, there-to relating, will never be forgotten, will never come to be disregarded,—on the contrary, the fruit of his labours on this field is yet to spring up and to gladden Scotland—perhaps England also, and the world.

We find that, throughout this article, we have been serving Dr. Hanna, very much as he has served himself in the course of his labours, in compiling these Memoirs. He, occupied with his great subject, has kept himself out of view; and we, warmed at the same fire, have been almost forgetting him—as he himself. But he will have his revenge of us. All the world has read, or will presently be reading, what he has written; and thousands of readers will be grateful to him for what he has done, so well, for their edification and pleasure; or even if they forget to render this deserved tribute, it will be because, with them, as with us, a Memoir of Chalmers, if worthily compiled, must in the nature of the case, quite fill the reader's thoughts and heart—criticism forgotten.

The first of these is the fact that the
 world is not a uniform whole, but a
 collection of many different parts, each
 with its own life and character. The
 second is that the world is not a static
 thing, but a living, growing organism.
 The third is that the world is not a
 simple machine, but a complex system
 of many interlocking parts. The fourth
 is that the world is not a collection of
 isolated facts, but a continuous stream
 of events. The fifth is that the world
 is not a collection of things, but a
 collection of people. The sixth is that
 the world is not a collection of ideas,
 but a collection of actions. The seventh
 is that the world is not a collection of
 words, but a collection of deeds. The
 eighth is that the world is not a
 collection of dreams, but a collection of
 realities. The ninth is that the world
 is not a collection of shadows, but a
 collection of lights. The tenth is that
 the world is not a collection of secrets,
 but a collection of truths. The eleventh
 is that the world is not a collection of
 mysteries, but a collection of wonders.
 The twelfth is that the world is not a
 collection of puzzles, but a collection of
 problems. The thirteenth is that the
 world is not a collection of questions,
 but a collection of answers. The
 fourteenth is that the world is not a
 collection of doubts, but a collection of
 certainties. The fifteenth is that the
 world is not a collection of fears, but a
 collection of hopes. The sixteenth is
 that the world is not a collection of
 sorrows, but a collection of joys. The
 seventeenth is that the world is not a
 collection of pains, but a collection of
 pleasures. The eighteenth is that the
 world is not a collection of hardships,
 but a collection of triumphs. The
 nineteenth is that the world is not a
 collection of failures, but a collection of
 successes. The twentieth is that the
 world is not a collection of losses, but a
 collection of gains. The twenty-first is
 that the world is not a collection of
 setbacks, but a collection of advances.
 The twenty-second is that the world
 is not a collection of disappointments,
 but a collection of fulfillments. The
 twenty-third is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 fourth is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 fifth is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 sixth is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 seventh is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 eighth is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The twenty-
 ninth is that the world is not a
 collection of disappointments, but a
 collection of fulfillments. The thirtieth
 is that the world is not a collection of
 disappointments, but a collection of
 fulfillments.

THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

No. XXXIV.

FOR AUGUST, 1852.

ART. I.—*Life of Lord Jeffrey: with a Selection from his Correspondence.* By LORD COCKBURN, one of the Judges of the Court of Session in Scotland. 2 vols. Edinburgh, 1852.

It was in the winter of 1786–7 that the poet Burns, a new prospect having been suddenly opened up to him by the kind intervention of Blacklock, and a few other influential men in Edinburgh, abandoned his desperate project of emigrating to the West Indies, and hastened to pay his first and memorable visit to the Scottish metropolis. During that winter, as all who are acquainted with his life know, the Ayrshire ploughman, then in his twenty-ninth year, was the lion of Edinburgh society. Lord Monboddo, Dugald Stewart, Harry Erskine, Dr. Robertson, Dr. Hugh Blair, Henry Mackenzie, Dr. Gregory, Dr. Black, Dr. Adam Ferguson—such were the names then most conspicuous in the literary capital of North Britain; and it was in the company of these men, alternated with that of the Creeches, the Smellies, the Willie Nicols, and other contemporary Edinburgh celebrities of a lower grade, that Burns first realized the fact that he was no mere bard of local note, but a new power and magnate in Scottish literature.

To those who are alive to the poetry of coincidences, two anecdotes connected with this residence of Burns in Edinburgh will always be specially interesting. What reader of Lockhart's *Life of Scott* is there who does not remember the account there given of Scott's first and only interview with Burns? As the story is now more minutely told in Mr. Robert Chambers's *Life of Burns*, Scott, who was then a lad of seventeen, just removed from the High

School to a desk in his father's office, was invited by his friend and companion, the son of Dr. Ferguson, to accompany him to his father's house on an evening when Burns was to be there. The two youngsters entered the room, sat down unnoticed by their seniors, and looked on and listened in modest silence Burns, when he came in, seemed a little out of his element, and, instead of mingling at once with the company, kept going about the room, looking at the pictures on the walls. One print particularly arrested his attention. It represented a soldier lying dead among the snow, his dog on one side, and a woman with a child in her arms on the other. Underneath the print were some lines of verse descriptive of the subject, which Burns read aloud with a voice faltering with emotion. A little while after, turning to the company and pointing to the print, he asked if any one could tell him who was the author of the lines. No one chanced to know, excepting Scott, who remembered that they were from an obscure poem of Langhorne's. The information, whispered by Scott to some one near, was repeated to Burns, who, after asking a little more about the matter, rewarded his young informant with a look of kindly interest, and the words, (Sir Adam Ferguson reports them,) "You'll be a man yet, sir." Such is the one story, the story of the "literary ordination," as Mr. Chambers well calls it, of Scott by Burns—a scene which we think Sir William Allan would have delighted to paint. The other story, we believe, is now told for the first time by Lord Cockburn. Somewhere about the very day on which the foregoing incident happened, "a little black creature" of a boy, we are told, who was going up the High Street of Edinburgh, and staring diligently about him, was attracted by the

appearance of a man whom he saw standing on the pavement. He was taking a good and leisurely view of the object of his curiosity, when some one standing at a shop-door tapped him on the shoulder, and said, "Ay, laddie, ye may weel look at that man! that's Robert Burns." The "little black creature," thus early addicted to criticism, was Francis Jeffrey, the junior of Scott by four years, and exactly four years behind him in the classes of the High School, where he was known as a clever, nervous, little fellow, who never lost a place without crying. It is mentioned as a curious fact by Lord Cockburn, that Jeffrey's first teacher at the High School, a Mr. Luke Fraser, had the singular good fortune of sending forth, from three successive classes of four years each, three pupils no less distinguished than Walter Scott, Francis Jeffrey, and Henry Brougham.

It is not for the mere purpose of anecdote that we cite these names and coincidences. We should like very much to make out for Scotland in general as suggestive a series of her intellectual representatives as Lord Cockburn has here made out for part of the pedagogic era of the worthy and long dead Mr. Luke Fraser. Confining our regards to the eighteenth century, the preceding paragraphs enable us to group together at least three conspicuous Scottish names as belonging, by right of birth, to the third quarter of that century—Burns, born in Ayrshire in 1759; Scott, born in Edinburgh in 1769; and Jeffrey, born in the same place in 1773. Supposing we go a little farther back for some other prominent Scottish names of the same century, the readiest to occur to the memory will be those of James Thomson, the poet, born in Roxburghshire in 1700; Thomas Reid, the philosopher, born near Aberdeen in 1710; David Hume, born at Edinburgh in 1711; Robertson, the historian, born in Mid-Lothian in 1721; Tobias Smollett, the novelist, born at Cardross in the same year; Adam Smith, born at Kirkaldy in 1723; Robert Fergusson, the Scottish poet, born at Edinburgh in 1750; and Dugald Stewart, born at Edinburgh in 1753. And if for a similar purpose, we come down to the last quarter of the century, five names at least will be sure to occur to us, in addition to that of Brougham—Thomas Campbell, born at Glasgow in 1777; Thomas Chalmers, born at Anstruther in Fifeshire in 1780, John Wilson, born, if we may trust our authorities, in Paisley in 1789; Thomas Carlyle, born at Ecclefechan in Dumfriesshire in 1795; and Sir William Hamilton, born at Edinburgh before the close of the century. In this list we omit the distin-

guished contemporary Scottish names in physical science; we ought not, however, to omit the names of Sir James Mackintosh, born near Inverness in 1765, and James Mill, born at Montrose in 1773. The short life of Burns, if we choose him as the central figure of the group, connects together all these names. The oldest of them was in the prime of life when Burns was born, and the youngest of them had seen the light before Burns died.

On glancing in order along this series of eminent Scotchmen born in the eighteenth century, it will be seen that they may be roughly distributed into two nearly equal classes—men of philosophic intellect, devoted to the work of general speculation, or thought as such; and men of literary or poetic genius, whose works belong more properly to the category of pure literary or artistic effort. In the one class may be ranked Reid, Hume, Adam Smith, Dugald Stewart, Mackintosh, Mill, Chalmers, and Sir William Hamilton; in the other, Thomson, Smollett, Robertson, Fergusson, Burns, Scott, Jeffrey, Campbell, Wilson, Irving, and Carlyle. Do not let us be mistaken. In using the phrases "philosophic intellect" and "literary genius," to denote the distinction referred to, we do not imply anything of accurate discrimination between the phrases themselves. For aught that we care, the phrases may be reversed, and the men of the one class may be styled men of philosophic genius, and those of the other, men of literary habit and intellect. If we prefer to follow the popular usage in our application of the terms, it is not with any intention of making out for the one class, by the appropriation to it of the peculiar term "genius," a certificate of a higher kind of excellence than belongs to the other. Even according to the popular acceptance of the term, several of those whom we have included in the literary category—as, for example, Robertson, must be denied the title of men of genius; while, according to no enduring definition of the term, could the title of men of genius be refused to such men as Adam Smith, or Chalmers, or Hamilton. Nor even, when thus explained, will our classification bear any very rigid scrutiny. By a considerable portion of what may be called the fundamental or unapparent half of his genius, Carlyle belongs to the class of speculative thinkers; while, on the other hand, the case of Chalmers is one in which the thinking or speculative faculty, which certainly belonged to him, was surcharged and deluged by such a constant flood from the feelings that, instead of ranking him with the thinkers as above, we might,

with equal or greater propriety, transpose him to the other side, or even name him on both sides. His thinking faculty, which was what he himself set most store by, was so beset and begirt by his other and more active dispositions, that instead of working on and on through any resisting medium with iron continuity, it discharged itself almost invariably, as soon as it touched a subject, in large proximate generalizations. On the whole, then, instead of the foregoing classification of eminent Scotchmen into men of speculation and men of general literature, one might adopt as equally serviceable a less formal classification which the common satirical talk respecting Scotchmen will suggest. The hard, cool, logical Scotchman—such is the stereotyped phrase in which Englishmen describe the natives of North Britain. There is a sufficient amount of true perception in the phrase to justify its use; but the appreciation it involves reaches only to the surface. The well-known phrase, *perfervidum ingenium Scotorum*, used, Buchanan tells us, centuries ago on the continent to express the idea of the Scottish character then universally current and founded on a large induction of instances, is, in reality, far nearer to the fact. Without maintaining at present that *all* Scotchmen are *perfervid*,—that Scotchmen in general are, as we have seen it ingeniously argued, not cool, calculating, and cautious, but positively rash, fanatical, and tempestuous; it will be enough to refer to the instances which prove at least that *some* Scotchmen have this character. The thing may be expressed thus.—On referring to the actual list of Scotchmen who have attained eminence by their writings or speeches in this or the last century, two types may be distinguished, in one or the other of which the Scottish mind seems necessarily to cast itself—an intellectual type specifically Scottish, but Scottish only in the sense that it is the type which cultured Scottish minds assume when they devote themselves to the work of specific investigation; and a more popular type, characterizing those Scotchmen who, instead of pursuing the work of specific investigation, follow a career calling forth all the resources of Scottish sentiment. Scotchmen of the first or more recondite and formal type are Reid, Smith, Hume, Mill, Mackintosh, and Hamilton, in all of whom, notwithstanding their differences, we see that tendency toward metaphysical speculation for which the Scottish mind has become celebrated; Scotchmen of the other or popular type, partaking of the metaphysical tendency or not, but drawing their essential inspiration from the sentimental depths of the national character, are

Burns, Scott, Chalmers, Irving, and Carlyle. However we may choose to express it, the fact of this two-fold forthgoing of the Scottish mind, either in the scholastic and logical direction marked out by one series of eminent predecessors, or in the popular and literary direction marked out by another series of eminent predecessors, cannot be denied.

After all, however, (for we cannot yet leave this topic,) there *is*, classify and distinguish as we may, a remarkable degree of homogeneity among Scotchmen. The people of North Britain are more homogeneous—have decidedly a more visible basis of common character—than the people of South Britain. A Scotchman may indeed be almost anything that is possible in this world; he may be a saint or a debauchee, a Christian or a sceptic, a spendthrift or a usurer, a soldier or a statesman, a poet or a statistician, a fool or a man of genius, clear-headed or confused-headed, a Thomas Chalmers or a Joseph Hume, a dry man of mere secular facts, or a man through whose mind there roll for ever the stars and all mysteries. Still, under every possible form of mental combination or activity, there will be found in every Scotchman something distinguishable as his birth-quality or *Scotticism*. And what is this *Scotticism* of Scotchmen—this ineradicable, universally-combinable element or peculiarity, breathed into the Scottish soul by those conditions of nature and of life which inhere in or hover over the area of Scottish earth, and which are repeated in the same precise *ensemble* nowhere else? Comes it from the hills, or the moors, or the mists, or any of those other features of scenery and climate which distinguish bleak and rugged Scotland from green and fertile England? In part, doubtless, from these, as from all else that is Scottish. But there are hills, and moors, and mists where Scotchmen are not bred; and it is rather in the long series of the memorable things that have been done on the Scottish hills and moors—the acts which the retrospective eye sees *flashing* through the old Scottish mists, that one is to seek the origin and explanation of whatever *Scotticism* is. Now, as compared with England at least, that which has come down to the natives of Scotland as something peculiar, generated by the series of past transactions of which their country has been the scene, is an intense spirit of nationality.

No nation in the world is more factitious than the Scotch—more composite as regards the materials out of which it has been constructed. If in England there have been Britons, Celts, Romans, Saxons, Danes, and Normans, in Scotland there have been Celts,

Britons, Romans, Norwegians, Danes, Anglo-Saxons, and Normans. The only difference of any consequence in this respect probably is, that whereas in England the Celtic element is derived chiefly from the British or Welsh, and the Teutonic element chiefly from the Continental-German source, in Scotland the Gaels have furnished most of the Celtic, and the Scandinavian Germans most of the Teutonic element. Nor, if we regard the agencies that have acted intellectually on the two nations, shall we find Scotland to have been less notably affected from without than England. To mention only one circumstance, the Reformation in Scotland was marked by a much more decided importation of new modes of thinking and new social forms than the Reformation in the sister country. But though quite as factitious, therefore, as the English nation, the Scottish, by reason of its very smallness, for one thing, has always possessed a more intense consciousness of its nationality, and a greater liability to be acted upon throughout its whole substance by a common thought or common feeling. Even as late as the year 1707, the entire population of Scotland did not exceed one million of individuals; and if, going farther back, we fancy this small nation placed on the frontier of one so much larger, and obliged continually to defend itself against the attacks of so powerful a neighbor, we can have no difficulty in conceiving how, in the smaller nation, the feeling of a central life would be sooner developed and kept more continuously active. The sentiment of nationality is essentially negative; it is the sentiment of a people which has been taught to recognize its own inviduality by incessantly marking the line of exclusion between itself and others. Almost all the great movements of Scotland, as a nation, have accordingly been of a negative character, that is, movements of self-defence—the War of National Independence against the Edwards; the Non-Episcopal struggle in the reigns of the Charleses; and even the Non-Intrusion controversy of later times. The very motto of Scotland, as a nation, is negative—*Nemo me impune lacesset*. It is different with England. There have of course been negative movements in England too, but these have been movements of one faction or part of the English people against another; and the activity of the English nation, as a whole, has consisted, not in preserving its own individuality from external attack, but in fully and genially evolving the various elements which it finds within itself or in powerful positive exertions of its strength upon what lies outside it.

The first and most natural form of what

we have called the Scotticism of Scotchmen, that is, of the peculiarity which differences them from people of other countries, and more expressly from Englishmen, is this *amor patriæ*, this inordinate intensity of national feeling. There are very few Scotchmen who, whatever they may pretend, are devoid of this pride of being Scotchmen. Penetrate to the heart of any Scotchman, even the most Anglified, or the most philosophic that can be found, and there will certainly be found a remnant in it of loving regard for the little land that lies north of the Tweed. And what eminent Scotchman can be named in whose constitution a larger or smaller proportion of the *amor Scotiæ* has not been visible? In some of the foremost of such men, as Burns, Scott, and Wilson, this *amor Scotiæ* has even been present as a confessed ingredient of their genius,—a sentiment determining, to a great extent, the style and matter of all that they have written or attempted.

"The rough bur-thistle spreading wide

Among the bearded bear,—

I turn'd the weeding-heuk aside,

And spared the symbol dear.

No nation, no station

My envy e'er could raise—

A Scot still, but blot still,

I knew nae higher praise."

In reading the writings of such men, one is perpetually reminded, in the most direct manner, that these writings are to be regarded as belonging to a strictly national literature. But even in those Scotchmen in the determination of whose intellectual efforts the *amor Scotiæ* has acted no such obvious and ostensible part, the presence of some mental reference to, or intermittent communication of sentiment with, the land of their birth, is almost sure to be detected. The speculations of Reid and Hume and Adam Smith, and, in some degree, also, those of Chalmers, were in subjects interesting not to Scotchmen alone, but to the human race as such; and yet, precisely as these men enunciated their generalities intended for the whole world in good broad Scotch, so had they all, after their different ways, a genuine Scottish relish for Scottish humours, jokes, and antiquities. The same thing is true of Carlyle, a power as he is recognized to be not in Scottish only, but in all British literature. Even James Mill, who, more than most Scotchmen, succeeded in conforming, both in speech and in writing, to English habits and requirements, relapsed into a Scotchman when he listened to a Scottish song, or told a Scottish anecdote. But perhaps the most interesting example of the ap-

pearance of an intense *amor Scotiæ*, where, from the nature of the case, it could have been least expected, is afforded by the writings of Sir William Hamilton. If there is a man now alive conspicuous among his contemporaries for the exercise on the most magnificent scale of an intellect the most pure and abstract, that man is Sir William; and yet, not even when discussing the philosophy of the unconditioned or perfecting the theory of syllogism which is universal, does Sir William forget his Scottish lineage. With what glee, in his notes, or in stray passages in his dissertations themselves, does he seize every opportunity of adding to the proofs that speculation in general has been largely affected by the stream of specific Scottish thought—quoting, for example, the saying of Scaliger, "*Les Écossois sont bons Philosophes*;" or dwelling on the fact that at one time almost every continental university had a Scottish professorship of philosophy, specially so named; or reviving the memories of defunct Balfours, and Duncans, and Chalmerses, and Dalgarnos, and other "*Scoti extra Scotiam agentes*" of other centuries; or startling his readers with such genealogical facts as that Immanuel Kant and Sir Isaac Newton had Scottish grandfathers, and that the celebrated French metaphysician Destutt Tracy was, in reality, but a transmogrified Scotchman of the name of Stott! We know nothing more refreshing than such evidences of strong national feeling in such a man. It is the Scottish Stagirite not ashamed of the bonnet and plaid; it is the philosopher in whose veins flows the blood of a Covenanter.

Even now, when Scotchmen, their native country having been so long merged in the higher unity of Great Britain, labour altogether in the interest of this higher unity, and forget or set aside the smaller, they are still liable to be affected characteristically in all that they do by the consciousness that they are Scotchmen. This will be found true whether we regard those Scotchmen who work side by side with Englishmen in the conduct of British public affairs or British commerce, or those Scotchmen who vie with Englishmen in the walks of British authorship and literature. In either case the Scotchman is distinguished from the Englishman by this, that he carries the consciousness of his nationality about with him. Were he, indeed, disposed to forget it, the banter on the subject to which he is perpetually exposed in the society of his English friends and acquaintances, would serve to keep him in mind of it. It is the same now with the individual Scotchman cast among Englishmen as it was with the Scottish na-

tion when it had to defend its frontier against the English armies. He is in the position of a smaller body placed in contact with a larger one, and rendered more intensely conscious of his individuality by the constant necessity of asserting it. But this self-assertion of a Scotchman among Englishmen, this constant feeling "I am a Scotchman," rests, like the feeling of nationality itself, on a prior assertion of what is in fact a negative. For a Scotchman to be always thinking "I am a Scotchman," is, in the circumstances now under view, tantamount to always thinking "I am *not* an Englishman." The Englishman, on the other hand, has no corresponding feeling. As a member of the large body, whose corporate activity has always, from the very circumstance of its being the larger, been positive rather than negative, the Englishman simply acts out harmoniously his English instincts and tendencies, the feeling of not being a Scotchman, never (except in the case of a stray Englishman located in Scotland) either spontaneously remaining in his mind, or being roused in it by banter. The Scotchman, in short, who works in the general field of British activity, has his thoughts conditioned to some extent at least by the negative of not being an Englishman; the Englishman thinks under no such limitation.

And this leads us to a definition more essential and intimate of the peculiarity of Scottish as compared with English thought. The rudest and most natural form of what we have called the Scotticism of Scotchmen, consists, we have hitherto been saying, in simple consciousness of nationality, simple *amor Scotiæ*, or, under mere restricted circumstances, the simple feeling of not being an Englishman. There are some Scotchmen, however, in whom this first and most natural form of Scotticism is not very well pronounced, and who are either emancipated from it, or think that they are. We know not a few Scottish minds who have really succeeded in transferring their enthusiastic regards from Scotland as such to the higher unity of Great Britain—men, who, sometimes speaking in their own Scottish accent, sometimes in an accent almost purely English, find the objects of their solicitude and admiration, not in the land lying north of the Tweed, but rather in England—its rich green parks and fields, its broad ecclesiastical hierarchy, its noble halls of learning, its majestic and varied literature, the full and generous character of its manly people. We know Scotchmen whose sentiment is more deeply stirred by Shakespeare's famous apostrophe to "this England," than by Scott's to the land of brown heath and

shaggy wood. And as Scotland and England are incorporated, such men are and must be on the increase. But even they shall not escape. If their native quality of Scotticism does not survive in them in the more palpable and open form of mere national feeling, mere *amor Scotiæ*, it survives, nevertheless, in an intellectual habit, having the same root, and as indestructible. And what is this habit? The popular charges of dogmatism, opinionativeness, pugnacity, and the like, brought against Scotchmen by Englishmen, are so many approximations to a definition of it. For our part, we should say, that the special habit or peculiarity which distinguishes the intellectual manifestations of Scotchmen—that, in short, in which the Scotticism of Scotchmen most intimately consists,—is the habit of *emphasis*. All Scotchmen are emphatic. If a Scotchman is a fool, he gives such emphasis to the nonsense he utters as to be infinitely more insufferable than a fool of any other country; if a Scotchman is a man of genius, he gives such emphasis to the good things he has to communicate, that they have a supremely good chance of being at once or very soon attended to. This habit of emphasis, we believe, is exactly that *perferendum ingenium Scotorum* which used to be remarked some centuries ago, wherever Scotchmen were known. But emphasis is perhaps a better word than fervour. Many Scotchmen are fervid too, but not all; but all, absolutely all, are emphatic. No one will call Joseph Hume a fervid man, but he is certainly emphatic. And so with David Hume, or Reid, or Adam Smith, or any of those colder-natured Scotchmen of whom we have spoken; fervour cannot be predicated of them, but they had plenty of emphasis. In men like Burns, or Chalmers, or Irving, on the other hand, there was both emphasis and fervour; so also with Carlyle; and so, under a still more curious combination, with Sir William Hamilton. And as we distinguish emphasis from fervour, so would we distinguish it from perseverance. Scotchmen are said to be persevering, but the saying is not universally true; Scotchmen are or are not morally persevering, but all Scotchmen are intellectually emphatic. Emphasis, we repeat, intellectual emphasis—the habit of laying stress on certain things rather than co-ordinating all—in this consists what is essential in the Scotticism of Scotchmen. And, as this observation is empirically verified by the very manner in which Scotchmen enunciate their words in ordinary talk, so it might be deduced scientifically from what we have already said regarding the nature and effects of the feeling

of nationality. The habit of thinking emphatically is a necessary result of thinking much in the presence of, and in resistance to, a negative; it is the habit of a people that has been accustomed to act on the defensive, rather than of a people peacefully self-evolved and accustomed to act positively; it is the habit of Protestantism rather than of Catholicism, of Presbyterianism rather than of Episcopacy, of Dissent rather than of Conformity.

The greatest effects which the Scottish mind has yet produced on the world—and these effects, by the confession of Englishmen themselves, have not been small—have been the results, in part at least, of this national habit of emphasis. Until towards the close of last century, the special department of labour in which Scotchmen had, to any great extent, exerted themselves so as to make a figure in the general intellectual world, was the department of Philosophy—Metaphysical and Dialectic. Their triumphs in this department are historical. What is called the Scottish Philosophy, constitutes, in the eyes of all who know anything of history, a most important stage in the intellectual evolution of modern times. From the time of those old Duncans, and Balfours, and Dalgarnos, mentioned by Sir William Hamilton, who discoursed on philosophy, and wrote dialectical treatises in Latin in all the cities of the Continent, down to our own days, we can point to a succession of Scottish thinkers in whom the interest of metaphysical studies was kept alive, and by whose labours new contributions to mental science were continually being made. It was by the Scottish mind, in fact, that the modern philosophy was conducted to that point where Kant and the Germans took it up. The qualifications of the Scottish mind for this task were, doubtless, various. Perhaps there was something in that special combination of the Celtic and the Scandinavian out of which the Scottish nation, for the most part, took its rise, to produce an aptitude for dialectical exercises. Nay, farther, it would not be altogether fanciful to suppose that those very national struggles of the Scotch in the course of which they acquired so strong a sense of their national individuality, that is, of the distinction between all that was Scotch and all that was not Scotch, served, in a rough way, to facilitate to all Scotchmen that fundamental idea of the distinction between the *Ego* and the *Non-Ego*, the clear and rigorous apprehension of which is the first step in philosophy, and the one test of the philosopher. But, in a still more important degree, we hold the success of the Scottish mind in

philosophy to have been the result of the national habit of intellectual emphasis. A Scotchman, when he thinks, cannot, so easily and comfortably as the Englishman, repose on an upper level of propositions co-ordinated for him by tradition, sweet feeling, and pleasant circumstance; that necessity of his nature which leads him to emphasise certain things rather than to take all things together in their established co-ordination, drives him down and still down in search of certain generalities whereon he may see that all can be built. It was this habit of emphasis, this inability to rest on the level of sweetly-composed experience, that led Hume to scepticism; it was the same habit, the same inability, conjoined, however, with more of faith and reverence, that led Reid to lay down in the chasm of Hume's scepticism certain blocks of ultimate propositions or principles, capable of being individually enumerated, and yet, as he thought, forming a sufficient basement for all that men think or believe. And the same tendency is visible among Scotchmen now. It amazes Scotchmen to see on what proximate propositions even Englishmen who are celebrated as thinkers can rest, and how little the best of them, such as Whewell, Maurice, Hare, Henry Taylor, and some others, seem to feel the necessity of persisting towards first principles. The essays of Henry Taylor and of Arthur Helps are, in this respect, most characteristically English. As writings, they are most sweet, solid, and soothing; and yet there is many a Scotchman with not half the intellect of either of the writers, to whom, by reason of his native tendency to seek for the emphatic, they would appear almost shallow. So also with that much praised old English book, Browne's *Religio Medici*, and with many other old English prose writing. The truth is that, if Scotchmen have, so far, a source of superiority over Englishmen in their habit of dwelling only on the emphatic, they have also in this same habit a source of inferiority. Quietism, mysticism, that soft meditative disposition which takes things for granted in the co-ordination established by mere life and usage, pouring into the confusion thus externally given the rich oil of an abounding inner joy, interpenetrating all and harmonizing all—these are, for the most part, alien to the Scotchman. No, his walk, as a thinker, is not by the meadows, and the wheat-fields, and the green lanes, and the ivy-clad parish churches, where all is gentle, and antique, and fertile, but by the bleak sea-shore which parts the certain from the limitless, where there is doubt in the sea-mew's shriek, and where it

is well if, in the advancing tide, he can find footing on a rock among the tangle! But this very tendency of his towards what is intellectually extreme, injures his sense of proportion in what is concrete and actual; and hence it is that when he leaves the field of abstract thought, and betakes himself to creative literature, he produces nothing comparable in fulness, wealth, and harmoniousness to the imaginations of a Chaucer or a Shakespeare. The highest genius, indeed, involves also the capability of the intellectual extreme; and, accordingly, in the writings of those great Englishmen, as well as in those of the living English poet Tennyson, there are strokes in abundance of that pure intellectual emphasis in which the Scotchman delights; but then there is also with them such a genial acceptance of all things, great or small, in their established co-ordination, that the flashes of emphasis are as if they came not from a battle done on an open moor, but from a battle transacting itself in the depths of a forest. Among Scottish thinkers, Mackintosh is the one that approaches nearest to the English model, a circumstance which may be accounted for by the fact that much of what he did consisted, from the necessities of the object-matter of his speculations, in judicious compromise.

But even in the field of literature we will not abandon the Scotchman. His habit of emphasis has here enabled him to do good service too. His entry on this field, however, was later than his entry on the field of philosophy. True, there had been, contemporary with the Scottish philosophers, or even anterior to them, Scottish poets and general prose writers of note—Dunbar, Gawin Douglas, King James, Buchanan, Sir David Lindsay, Henderson, Sir George Mackenzie, Allan Ramsay, and the like. True, also, in those snatches of popular ballad and song which came down from generation to generation in Scotland, many of them written by no one knew who, and almost all of them overflowing with either humour or melancholy, there was at once a fountain and a promise of an exquisite national literature. We could think of old Nicol Burn, the violer, till our eyes filled with tears.

“ But minstrel Burn cannot assuage
His woes while time endureth,
To see the changes of this age
Which fleeting time procureth.
Full many a place stands in hard case
Where joy was wont beforrow,
With Humes that dwelt on Leader side,
And Scotts that dwelt on Yarrow.”

There was literature in the times when

such old strains were sung. But the true avatar of the Scottish mind in modern literature, came later than the manifestation of the same mind in Philosophy. Were we to fix a precise date for it, we should name the period of Burns's first visit to Edinburgh, and familiar meetings with the men of literary talent and distinction then assembled there. Edinburgh was, indeed, even then a literary capital, boasting of its Monboddos, and Stewarts, and Robertsons, and Blairs, and Mackenzies, and Gregories—men who had already begun the race of literary rivalry with their contemporaries south of the Tweed. But, so far as the literary excellence of these men did not depend on their participation in that tendency to abstract thinking, which had already produced its special fruit in the Scottish Philosophy, it consisted in little more than a reflection or imitation of what was already common and acknowledged in the prior or contemporary literature of South Britain. To write essays such as those of the *Spectator*; to be master of a style which Englishmen should pronounce pure, and to produce compositions in that style worthy of being ranked with the compositions of English authors—such was the aim and aspirations of Edinburgh literati, between whom and their London cousins there was all the difference that there is between the latitude of Edinburgh and the latitude of London, between the daily use of the broad Scotch dialect, and the daily use of the classic English. For Scotland this mere imitation of English models was but a poor and unsatisfactory vein of literary enterprise. What was necessary was the appearance of some man of genius who should flash through all that, and who, by the application to literature, or the art of universal expression, of that same Scottish habit of emphasis which had already produced such striking and original results in philosophy, should teach the Scottish nation its true power in literature, and show a first example of it. Such a man was Burns. He it was who, uniting emotional fervour with intellectual emphasis, and drawing his inspiration from all those depths of sentiment in the Scottish people which his predecessors, the philosophers, had hardly so much as touched, struck for the first time a new chord, and revealed for the first time what a Scottish writer could do by trusting to the whole wealth of Scottish resources. And from the time of Burns, accordingly, there has been a series of eminent literary Scotchmen quite different from that series of hard logical Scotchmen who had till then been the most conspicuous representatives of their country in the eyes of

the reading public of Great Britain—a series of Scotchmen displaying to the world the power of emphatic sentiment and emphatic expression as strikingly as their predecessors had displayed the power of emphatic reasoning. While the old philosophic energy of Scotland still remained unexhausted, the honours of Reid and Hume and Smith and Stewart passing on to such men as Brown and Mill and Mackintosh and Hamilton (in favour of the last of whom even Germany has resigned her philosophic interregnum), the specially literary energy which had been awakened in the country descended along another line in the persons of Scott, and Jeffrey, and Chalmers, and Campbell, and Wilson, and Carlyle. Considering the amount of influence exerted by such men upon the whole spirit and substance of British literature,—considering how disproportionate a share of the whole literary produce of Great Britain in the nineteenth century has come either from them or from other Scotchmen,—and considering what a stamp of peculiarity marks all that portion of this produce which is of Scottish origin, it does not seem too much to say, that the rise and growth of Scottish Literature is as notable a historical phenomenon as the rise and growth of the Scottish Philosophy. And considering, moreover, how lately Scotland has entered on this literary field, how little time she has had to display her powers, how recently she was in this respect savage, and how much of her savage vitality yet remains to be articulated in civilized books, may we not hope that her literary avatar is but beginning, and has a goodly course yet to run? From the Solway to Caithness we hear a loud Amen!

In thus connecting the name and the memory of Jeffrey with the history of the internal intellectual development and the external intellectual action of his native land, we have done a thing which he himself would have been the last to repudiate, and which, whether he would have repudiated it or not, is natural, just, and becoming. Everything is as it is possible for it to be; and that the new era of British criticism was inaugurated by a Scotchman is a proof that a Scotchman was the man to inaugurate it. What, then was Jeffrey among Scotchmen, and what were the talents and circumstances that fitted him for his task?

The life of Jeffrey by Lord Cockburn is a work of very great merit, intrinsically worth a hundred of such lives of distinguished men as are daily proceeding from the press. It is not, indeed, an artistic biography; it does not shape and mould the character of Jeffrey by a succession of de-

scriptive touches, and deposit it finally as a finished conception of the man in the minds of distant readers; it contains no elaborate or subtle appreciation of Jeffrey's more intimate views and feelings, or of his place and function in the literary movement of his time. But the writer knew and loved his subject, and it was not for the purpose of making a book that he wrote his life. He had known him in youth, he had known him in old age; he had been his friend and daily companion;—not a sentence, therefore, did he write, but the lineaments of the dead were before him, and the old familiar tones were present to his ear. It would be a miracle, then, if he had written untruly, and if some image of the man as he really was were not placed before the reader. Add to this, that the successive events of Jeffrey's life are duly recorded and explained; and that the appended selection from his letters is at once ample and judicious. In one portion of the Life, too, Lord Cockburn, as was to be expected, has acquitted himself in a manner quite masterly. This is where he describes the condition of Scotland in general, and of society in Edinburgh in particular, at the time when Jeffrey entered upon public and literary life. Nothing could be better than the sketches given of the state of Scottish politics at that period, and of the more prominent personages who were then connected with the Scottish Bar, or otherwise invested with importance in the public opinion of the country. Macaulay could have done this part of the book with finer literary art, but not with more clear and thorough insight. One is glad to see that, notwithstanding a certain tendency to euphuism, as if Lord Cockburn had throughout the book laid a restraint on the well-known vigour of his Scottish sense and humour, lest by indulging it he should Scotticize Jeffrey too much, the Scotchman nevertheless breaks through sufficiently to remind all who know the author by repute, that a man more thoroughly Scotch at heart is not now known to the purlieus of the Parliament House, or familiar to the citizens of the New Town of Edinburgh. With Lord Cockburn for our guide, therefore, let us view Jeffrey for a little longer against his native background of Scottish manners and Scottish associations.

From his very boyhood, Jeffrey belonged to a rather peculiar type of the Scottish *physique* and character. The son of a genuine citizen of Edinburgh, attached as a clerk to its law courts, and described as a sensible, plodding, and somewhat morose man, Jeffrey, even at the High School, was noted as a sharp, nervous, swarthy little fellow, of a

type and physiognomy different from that of the majority of Scottish boys. Walter Scott, though at first a sickly and lame scholar, almost always absent from the classes, grew up a stalwart fair-haired youth, capable of taking part in a row in the pit of a theatre, or in any other freak that required bone and sinew; Jeffrey, with plenty of spirit and alacrity, remained always sharp, incisive, and diminutive. Transferred at the age of fourteen to Glasgow College, where he received the better part of his academic training, and where he was one of the most distinguished pupils of one of the best professors that ever taught in a Scotch University—John Jardine, Professor of Logic—he became known there to his heavier class-fellows, as an extremely quick, fluent, petulant youth, unmercifully severe in his criticisms on the essays of other students: not very sparing in his comments even on the professors; and who, in spite of raillery and the Glasgow decorum of those days, persisted in the whim of cherishing a very black moustache, covering the whole of his upper lip. Even at this time he was a great reader, a rapid writer for his own amusement, and a favourite speaker in the College Clubs and Societies. After two years at Glasgow, he returned to Edinburgh, where he spent two years more, partly in attending the law-classes at the University, partly in miscellaneous literary occupations prescribed by himself. The quantity of manuscript, in the form of essays, translations, orations, and even poems, produced by him at this period, or between his sixteenth and nineteenth year, was, as we learn from his biographer, something quite extraordinary; and it is curious to remark in the extracts which are given from some of these productions, the early and decided tendency of Jeffrey's mind to literary criticism. Almost all his own essays, it appears, had appended to them a paragraph or two of self-criticism,—generally a very slashing review of their merits and demerits on a retrospective perusal of them; and one manuscript of seventy folio pages is devoted to an elaborate analysis of his own character. A sample of Jeffrey at seventeen reviewing himself may not be uninteresting. The following is from a criticism appended to a collection of thirty essays:—

"It was, I thought, and so far I surely did think justly, a very essential point for a young man to acquire the habit of expressing himself with ease upon subjects which he is unavoidably one time or another to talk of. This, to be sure, might perhaps have been attained, in a degree adequate to all common occasions, without being at the trouble to write down all that I

said, or might have said, on them; and as the habit of writing and speaking are not reciprocal, the plan of accustoming myself to speak a great deal upon them may perhaps appear better calculated for this purpose. But besides that I thus avoid many inaccuracies, and, as I am in Scotland, many improprieties, I can spare auditors from the fatigue of being the tools and vehicles of my experiment, and save myself from the reputation of talkativeness and folly. But though the habit of speaking easily be a very valuable one, that of thinking correctly is undoubtedly much more so. This, too, cannot be attained by mere mechanical practice, and an earlier exertion of those powers, with which every one is endued, is absolutely necessary to confirm it. The human mind, at least mine, which is all I have to do with, is such a chaotic confused business, such a jumble and hurry of ideas, that it is absolutely impossible to follow the train and extent of our ideas upon any one topic, without more exertion than the conception of them required. To remedy this, and to fix the bounds of our knowledge and belief on any subject, there is no way but to write down, deliberately and patiently, the notions which first naturally present themselves on that point; or, if we refuse any, taking care it be such as have assumed a place in our minds merely from the influence of education or prejudice, and not those which the hand of reason has planted, and which have been nurtured by the habit of reflection. . . . The only other object I had in view was, perhaps not the least important of the whole, to attempt an imitation of the style and manner of the principal persons who have exhibited their abilities in periodical and short essays. Dr. Johnson, Addison, Mackenzie, and Steele, are the only personages I have attempted to ape, and these it would be absurd in me to cope with. I have at least this consolation, that my emulation can be called by no means little. Of these essays I have little more to say. I have, in truth, said perhaps already more than they deserve."—*Life*, pp. 30-33.

Here, for a youth of seventeen, we have certainly industry, ambition, a swift, sharp audacity of opinion, and a wonderful fluency of words. That much envied faculty, usually called "command of language," Jeffrey, if we may judge from this and similar specimens, certainly had from the first. In fact, it is not treating the thing too seriously to note, in connexion with such a specimen, the early appearance of what was all along Jeffrey's defect. We have spoken of emphasis as most specifically the quality of the Scottish mind; and we have described as the proper manifestation of this emphasis in the direction of *thought*, that resolute striving after first principles, that tendency to rest only on distinct and massive generalities, which has been conspicuously exhibited in the works of the Scottish thinkers. Now in this kind of emphasis, or at least in emphasis leading to this result, Jeffrey was certainly deficient. Nimble leaping from

point to point, from commonplace to something better, and from something better back to commonplace, but always with a distinct and characteristic meaning in the end; a hawk-like ease of motion, and keenness of vision in the atmosphere of what may be called the proximate notions of educated men—this, rather than a sluggish attachment to certain propositions or maxims emphasised once for all, or than a tendency, in every individual case of intellectual exertion, to push through the object-matter, and carry all on to the terminus of some new proposition that *might* be emphasised and clung to, was the mental peculiarity of Jeffrey. As soon as he began to write, his acute mind darted along from conception to conception, seizing points of real truth and consequence, and insinuating itself with great delicacy into the longest and most winding intricacies; words, too, flowed in abundance, most apt for the expression of his meaning; but instead of stemming the words as they came, and damming them back, as it were by a mental resolve, till by their very accumulation and pressure the meaning to be finally expressed became deep and weighty, he suffered himself to be carried along in their flow, not completing the thought first, but thinking as he swam. This "command of language," indeed, so soon conspicuous in Jeffrey, is not an unfrequent sign of promising talent in early life; but we have generally found it give way, with men of real ability, before youth was over, under the influence of a newly-awakened tendency towards the deep and precise in thought. Nor can we help thinking that, had anything occurred, during Jeffrey's youth, to arrest his native fluency, and to arouse him to the value of that kind of mental effort which seeks for ultimate propositions, and spends itself in framing them, even he would have turned out a more weighty and thoroughgoing writer, after the peculiar Scottish type. But probably, Jardine's class rather stimulated than repressed his native tendency in this respect; and of neither of the two men who in that day were the best academic representatives of the claims of matter as distinct from those of style—Miller of Glasgow, and Dugald Stewart of Edinburgh—was Jeffrey ever the pupil. What of the Scottish tendency to emphatic thought, therefore, Jeffrey possessed—and much of it he did possess—was revealed not so much in a reference to, or a gravitation towards, deep formal propositions on various subjects, as in a general salience he always contrived to give to what he accounted important, a kind of sharp decisive ring of the voice on

what *he* believed and *you* might doubt. On the whole, he had far more of the Scottish tendency to thought as such than Scott, in whom the national turn for emphasis spent itself entirely in sentiment and descriptive expression, and who, as the very form of his head indicated, abode contentedly all his life among the popular sagacities, and eschewed all movement towards the intellectually extreme.

A brief residence by Jeffrey in Oxford in 1791-2, always remembered by him as a time of insupportable loneliness and ennui, had at least one effect upon him which, like his moustache at Glasgow, exposed him to the raillery of his Scottish friends. "Jeffrey," Lord Holland afterwards said, "had lost the broad Scotch at Oxford, but he had gained only the narrow English." No one, indeed, could hear Jeffrey in after life without noting, as something peculiar, his sharp, petulant, high-keyed manner of pronouncing his words, so different from either the broad full sing-song of a genuine Scottish speaker, or the firm and manly speech of an educated Englishman. The change was a bold one for a Scottish youth of that day. As late as fifteen years ago, in most parts of Scotland, a schoolboy that should have presumed to talk English, except on stated occasions within school, or that even then should have exhibited too sedulous a study of the vowel-sounds in Walker's Dictionary, would have been treated as a daw with borrowed feathers, and unmercifully plucked. In Jeffrey's case, however, the little affectation, if such it was, which led him to pick up the English accent, was something pleasantly characteristic. He never really ceased to be a Scotchman. Till his dying day, the *amor patriæ* was conspicuously strong in him, and he never lost his relish for Scottish humours and Scottish phraseology. He could talk Scotch when he liked, Lord Cockburn says, "as correctly as when the Doric of the Edinburgh Lawnmarket had been only improved in him by that of the Glasgow Rottenrow;" and we have it on undoubted authority that when, among his familiar friends, he took to telling his reminiscences of old Braxy and other notabilities of the Scottish Bench and Bar, no one could beat him as a mimic, and not even Scott could convey a Scotticism better.

Between Jeffrey's return from Oxford and his entry on professional life as a Scottish barrister, there intervened a period of two years, spent in law-studies, in agreeable intercourse with his friends; in brilliant speech-making at the weekly meetings of the famous Speculative Club, then and long afterwards the training school of young

celebrities native to Edinburgh, or sent thither from England to attend the University; and in the gratification of his literary propensity by the increase of his private stock of manuscripts on all sorts of subjects. He had serious thoughts, it appears, at one time of trying to become a poet. So convinced, however, is his biographer that this was a hallucination, that, with bundles of Jeffrey's early poetical efforts before him, he has not given us a single specimen. In the extracts given from the prose writings of the same period we recognise, in somewhat more matured combination, the same qualities that were discernible in the earlier productions—extreme fluency in tasteful expression; an intellect, swift, keen, and glancing, rather than deep or heavy, a cutting, unhesitating declaration of opinion *for* this or *against* that at a moment's notice; and a decided tendency to the practice of criticism.

It was with all these qualities developed in him in a degree that rendered him notable among the young men who knew him, and with an amount of general culture and knowledge such as was possessed by few of them, that Jeffrey, in the winter of 1794, assumed the gown and wig of a Scottish barrister. It is at this epoch in his life that he may be regarded as having first ceased to be a mere reader and student, and as having come into a position of practical relationship to Scottish polity, and the whole circle of Scottish interests. The population of Scotland may have then amounted to about a million and a half; Edinburgh was the centre of all the political activity of this small population: the lawyers of Edinburgh were its social aristocracy; and Jeffrey, as a young member of this aristocracy, had a more decided part to choose, and a more active future in prospect, than if he had been a mere ordinary citizen. We cannot better introduce the reader to an acquaintance with Jeffrey in this aspect than by quoting from Lord Cockburn's admirable delineation of the state of Scottish society towards the end of the last and the beginning of the present century.

"Everything was inflamed by the first French Revolution. Even in England all ordinary faction was absorbed by the two parties—of those who thought that that terrible example, by shewing the dangers of wrongs too long maintained, was the strongest reason for the timely correction of our own defects; and of those who considered this opinion as a revolutionary device, and held that the atrocities in France were conclusive against our exciting sympathetic hopes by any admission that curable defect existed. . . . Never, since our own Revolution, was there a period when public life was so

exasperated by hatred, or the charities of private life were so soured by political aversion.

"If this was the condition of England, with its larger population, its free institutions, its diffused wealth, and its old habits of public discussion, a few facts will account for the condition of Scotland. There was then in this country no popular representation, no emancipated burghs, no effective rival of the Established Church, no independent press, no free public meetings, and no better trial by jury, even in political cases, (except high treason,) than was consistent with the circumstances, that the jurors were not sent into Court under any impartial rule, and that, when in Court, those who were to try the case were named by the presiding judge. The Scotch representatives were only forty-five; of whom thirty were elected for counties, and fifteen for towns. Both from its price and its nature (being enveloped in feudal and technical absurdities) the elective franchise in counties, where alone it existed, was far above the reach of the whole lower, and of a great majority of the middle, and of many even of the higher ranks. There were probably not above 1500 or 2000 county electors in all Scotland; a body not too large to be held, Hope included, in Government's hand. The return, therefore, of a single opposition member was never to be expected. . . . Of the fifteen town members, Edinburgh returned one. The other fourteen were produced by clusters of four or five unconnected burghs electing each one delegate, and these four or five delegates electing the representative. Whatever this system may have been originally, it had grown, in reference to the people, into as complete a mockery as if it had been invented for their degradation. The people had nothing to do with it. It was all managed by Town-Councils, of never more than thirty-three members; and every Town-Council was self-elected, and consequently perpetuated its own interests. The election of either the town or county member was a matter of such utter indifference to the people, that they often only knew of it by the ringing of a bell, or by seeing it mentioned next day in a newspaper; for the farce was generally performed in an apartment from which, if convenient, the public could be excluded. . . . Scotland did not maintain a single opposition newspaper, or magazine, or periodical publication. . . . Meetings of the adherents of Government for party purposes, and for such things as victories and charities, were common enough. But, with ample materials for opposition meetings, they were in total disuse. I doubt if there was one held in Edinburgh between the year 1795 and the year 1820. Attendance was understood to be fatal. The very banks were overawed, and conferred their favours with a very different hand to the adherents of the two parties. . . . Thus, politically, Scotland was dead. It was not unlike a village at a great man's gate. Without a single free institution or habit, opposition was rebellion, submission probable success.

"If there had been any hope of ministerial change, or even any relief by variety of ministerial organs, the completeness of the Scotch subjugation might have been less. But the

whole country was managed by the undisputed and sagacious energy of a single native, who knew the circumstances, and the wants, and the proper bait, of every countryman worth being attended to. Henry Dundas, the first Lord Melville, was the Pharos of Scotland. Who steered upon him was safe; who disregarded his light was wrecked. It was to his nod that every man owed what he got, and looked for what he wished. Always at the head of some great department of the public service, and with the indirect command of places in every other department; and the establishments of Scotland, instead of being pruned, multiplying—the judges, the sheriffs, the clergy, the professors, the town-councillors, the members of parliament and of every public board, including all the officers of the revenue, and shoals of commissions in the military, the naval, and the Indian service, were all the breath of his nostril. This despotism was greatly strengthened by the personal character and manners of the man. Handsome, gentlemanlike, frank, cheerful, and social, he was a favourite with most men, and with all women. Too much a man of the world not to live well with his opponents when they would let him, and totally incapable of personal harshness or unkindness, it was not unnatural that his official favours should be confined to his own innumerable and insatiable partisans. With such means so dispensed, no wonder that the monarchy was absolute. . . . To be at the head of such a system was a tempting and corrupting position for a weak, a selfish, or a tyrannical man. But it enabled a man with a head and a temper like Dundas's to be absolute without making his subjects fancy that they ought to be offended. He was the very man for Scotland at that time, and is a Scotchman of whom his country may be proud. Skillful in Parliament, wise and liberal in Council, and with an almost unrivalled power of administration, the usual reproach of his Scotch management is removed by the two facts—that he did not *make* the bad elements he had to work with, and that he did not *abuse* them; which last is the greatest praise that his situation admits of.

"In addition to common political hostility, this state of things produced great personal bitterness. The insolence, or at least the confidence, of secure power on the one side, and the indignation of bad usage on the other, put the weaker party, and seemed to justify it, under a tacit proscription. It both excluded those of one class from all public trust, which is not uncommon, and obstructed their attempts to raise themselves anyhow. To an extent now scarcely credible, and curious to think of, it closed the doors and the hearts of friends against friends. There was no place where it operated so severely as at the Bar. . . . These facts enable us to appreciate the virtuous courage of those who really sought for the truth, and, having found it as they thought, openly espoused it. . . . The shires, with only a few individual exceptions, were soulless. But, in all towns, there were some thinking, independent men. Trade and manufactures were rising; the municipal population was increasing; the French Revolution, with its excitement and discussion of principles,

was exciting many minds. The great question of Burgh Reform, demonstrably clear in itself, but then denounced as revolutionary, had begun that deep and just feeling of discontent, which operated so beneficially on the public spirit of the citizens all over Scotland for the next forty years. The people were silent from prudence. A first conviction of simple sedition by a judge-named jury was followed by transportation for fourteen years. They, therefore, left their principles to the defence of the leading Whigs; who, without any special commission, had the moral authority that belongs to honesty and fearlessness. These were chiefly lawyers, whose powers and habits connected them with public affairs;—a bold and united band, without whose steadiness the very idea of independence would, for the day, have been extinguished in Scotland.”—*Life*, pp. 73-81.

To this small but devoted phalanx of Scottish Whigs Jeffrey from the first attached himself. Scott, as was more natural to a man of his predilections, took the other or Tory side. It is a sad thing, if one looks at the matter with any very serious attention, that good men in this world should be obliged thus to take sides at all, or at least to enrol themselves once for all under any one or any other ready-made denomination. One could wish that it were permitted to a man simply to look about for the good things he would like to see done, and to lend his help in time and season to the doing of them, never puzzling his head whether it was Whiggism to do this, or Toryism to do that, or whether the thing to be done had a name at all, provided it were clearly something reasonable in his private view of it. One could wish that what Burns, who still, however, called himself a Whig, once said of his politics, namely, that “he had a few first principles which he would not easily part with, but that, as to all the etiquette, &c., of the thing, he would not have a dissocial word about it with any of God’s creatures,” could be allowed to pass universally as confession of faith enough in political matters. But unfortunately this is impossible. Old port gathers bees’-wing—the more bees’-wing, they say, the better the wine; and so, in all societies that have lasted some time there float about traditional maxims and distinctions which one could wish away, were one not assured that they are signs of body and vigour in the very medium they perplex. And, certainly, after Lord Cockburn’s description of what Scottish Whiggism forty years ago was, and what it promised to be the exodus out of, one cannot but think that the most unsectarian man ever born into the world might, with perfect safety to his intellectual independence, have been a Scottish Whig. And yet such a source of virtue

is there in the antique; so natural is it for strong and genial minds to acquiesce in the conditions that actually exist, unless these are so bad as to outrage the most vital human requirements; such reciprocal kindness is there between a healthy tree and the soil where it has grown, that it may be doubted whether even Scottish Conservatism, which was by no means of the best sort, has not had men at least as notable to boast of as Scottish Whiggism. If on the one side there have been Brown, Playfair, and Jeffrey; on the other there have been Scott, and Chalmers, and Wilson. In short, all that one can say on such a subject is, that there are some men, and particularly men of sharp, clear intellect, who have a characteristic instinct towards the future, to-day called Whiggism, and to-morrow perhaps something else; and there are other men, and particularly men of large sentimental attachments, the moorings of whose being are mostly in the past. What substantial old fellows, now unnamed, or canonized only in local and civic memory, there must have been in Scotland under the rule of Melville; transacting, with perfect relish, a considerable amount of thoroughly human existence under it; nay, poor old kers, making their daily penny, and their annual oatmeal out of it! Yet Scottish Whiggism came to sweep them and the whole world of Dundas away, and who can now doubt that it was right it should?

Of Jeffrey’s services as a Scotch Whig—how, gradually, from being a mere cadet in the ranks of the party, he came to be one of its chiefs and leaders; how Scotch Whiggism itself, at first only a hand’s-breadth on the horizon, grew and grew under the care of himself and his friends, linking itself with the more powerful Whiggism of South Britain, till the whole atmosphere of the island was filled with Whig doctrine and Whig anticipation; how Jeffrey became in the end a Whig Member of Parliament, and helped in that capacity to deliver the surcharged atmosphere of the flash and thunderbolt of the Reform Bill; how he assisted to direct that special fork of the flash which fell upon Scotland, and shattered there the relics of the old Dundas system; and how Scotland willingly received him back from Parliament, when this service was done, as a Judge in her Supreme Court of Law, appointed by a Whig Government—of all this there is a sufficient account in the memoir by Lord Cockburn. Thither also we must refer our readers for an account of Jeffrey’s progress in his strictly professional life—his slow introduction to practice; his feats as a counsel, and his peculiar merits and reputation in this

capacity as compared with his rivals, the Clerks, the Cranstouns, the Moncreiffs, and (to add a name which the modesty of the biographer has concealed) the Cockburns of the contemporary Scottish Bar; as well as, finally, his demeanour and qualities as a Scottish Judge. It is enough here to say that, in his capacity both as a politician and as a lawyer, Jeffrey exhibited, with the highest effect, his peculiar combination of wonderful talents; and that, had he been during his whole life nothing else than a Scottish politician and a Scottish lawyer, he would still have been one of the most eminent Scotchmen of his generation. There was, indeed, a singular unity and individuality in all that he did. Whether he wrote or spoke as counsel, or gave judgment from the Bench, one still saw the same acute, clear, rapid, brilliant, peremptory, irresistible little creature. Were one to go to ornithology for a comparison, the falcon, which is said to be the strongest and most courageous bird of its size, might stand for the type of Jeffrey. With what a clear, brown, bright, almost too unabashed eye he saw everything; how readily he took wing; how rapidly and easily, whether in a straight line, or in descending circles, he bore himself to his object! His fluency alone astonished slow people. A good heavy Glasgow citizen who was defendant in a suit, after having listened with open mouth to the torrent of words in which Jeffrey, who was counsel for the plaintiff, addressed the Court against him, took out his watch and declared that, by a calculation according to the number of words uttered in a minute, the gentleman must have spoken the English language twice over in three hours. And as Jeffrey, though different from other Scottish writers, was still quite Scottish as a writer, so as a lawyer and a judge, though differing from his Scottish compeers, he was also essentially Scottish. Between such a man as Jeffrey, as representing the Scottish Bar, for example, and such a man as Follett, as representing the English, there was all the difference that there is between the two countries. In Jeffrey on the Bench, interrupting counsel in their pleadings, and keeping them to the point, somewhat to their discomfiture, one saw the same critical intellect that presided judicially over British literature in the *Edinburgh Review*; and yet all was in strict keeping, and Jeffrey was a true type of an able Scottish judge.

After all, however, as all the world knows, the main and characteristic performance of Jeffrey's life, the special stroke of Scottish emphasis which it fell to him to inflict (if that word would appease our Eng-

lish friends in the midst of so much ultra-Scotticism) upon the condition of British society in the nineteenth century, was the *Edinburgh Review*. We have to regard Jeffrey more closely, therefore, as the Editor and chief support, during twenty-seven years, of this famous Scottish periodical. *Scottish* periodical, we say; for though Sydney Smith was one of the Edinburgh conclave of young men by whom it was started, and though many distinguished Englishmen were among its contributors, the editorship, from the very first, devolved upon Jeffrey; and more than half the regular contributors—and these the most familiar to the editor, if not the closest to the centre of publication—were Scotchmen. Jeffrey alone contributed, between the commencement of the Review in October 1802, at which time he was a briefless barrister of twenty-nine years of age and just married, and his resignation of the editorship in June 1829, when he was appointed, in his fifty-sixth year, to the Deanship of the Scottish Bar, about two hundred separate articles,—that is, on an average, two articles to every number. In the first number he had six articles; and in not a few of the earlier numbers he had as many as four or five. Nothing seems to have interrupted his attention to the Review—neither the growing claims of his profession; nor the poignancy of his sad widowhood in 1805; nor his romantic voyage to America, in 1813, to wed his second wife. Even in his old age, Lord Cockburn and Jeffrey's own letters give us to understand, when the Review, after the death of the intervening editor, Mr. Macvey Napier, came under the management of his son-in-law, the present editor, Mr. Empson, he returned to it, like a septuagenarian re-introduced by circumstances to his first and somewhat aged love, and would often, in his quiet evenings at Craigerook, dabble again in editorial labours to amuse himself, and read or punctuate a favourite article. After his resignation of the editorship, however, in 1829, he contributed but three papers from his own pen. But between 1802 and 1829, the Review was more accurately and completely identified with his person than it is usual for any such periodical now to be identified with the person of even an active editor. What Jeffrey was, the Review was; and in his own series of contributions to its pages, its general scope, spirit, and power to influence were very adequately represented.

In the collection of his contributions to the Review, selected and republished by Jeffrey himself, eight years ago, and containing about half of the whole number, the

papers are loosely distributed under seven heads. A glance at these heads, and at the varied nature of the contents, under each, is calculated to give a lively impression of Jeffrey's readiness and versatility as a writer, and of his competence to the task of a universal observer and critic amid the passing phenomena of his time. It will be sufficient for us, in order to obtain a closer view of his talents and endeavours in this walk, to glance first at his writings on political topics, and then at his more numerous essays on subjects of general literature. To his performances as an occasional adventurer in the field of abstract and metaphysical discussion we can allude only incidentally.

For a definition of Jeffrey's principles as a politician and a political writer we have not far to seek. He was, both in his writings and his conduct, a consistent Whig; and if the reader is capable, as he may be with Lord Cockburn's help, of still farther discriminating between an English Whig and a Scottish Whig—between the Whiggism of Holland House, London, and the Whiggism of the Parliament House in Edinburgh—he will be master of a yet closer definition of Jeffrey's politics, by thinking of him as a *Scottish Whig*. A distinguished and conscientious member of that great party, representing so large a mass of British sentiment and opinion, which may be considered to have had Fox for its hero, and of which Lord John Russell is now the most characteristic relic,—but a member of that party, who, being Scotch by his nativity and in his circumstances, not only had the special duty allotted to him of superintending the applications of Whiggism to that portion of British society which lies north of the Tweed, but, moreover, contributed largely, by his intellectual activity in the cause, to infuse something of Scottish theory into British Whiggism in general, and to blend, as it were, the two political atmospheres which the Tweed separates,—such, in politics both practical and speculative, was Jeffrey. In this respect, also, therefore, we regard Jeffrey as properly an agency in the gradual diffusion through British thought of the element of modern Scotticism. It is indeed a fact which no reasoning can rob of its significance, that though the battle of Whiggism, as a practical movement, was fought in London, (and necessarily so, parliament being there), the literary part of the business was done in Edinburgh. The buff and the blue were worn in England in mere coats and waistcoats, articles whose explanatory power, as regards the creed which they symbolized,

reached no farther, as one may say, than just dogmatically affirming the Whig proposition, and declaring that there were so many backs and breasts in support of it; it was in Scotland, the country of emphatic articulation, that Whiggism mounted to the head, and that the Whig colours were used not only in the costume of men, but also in the costume of a periodical. Burke, indeed, had in some respects been the literary organ of Whiggism; but Burke was an Irishman. Charles Fox, too, was *par excellence* the Whig orator; but his oratory consisted rather in splendid practical assertions of English Whig feeling on cases as they occurred, than in connected elucidations of the theory of Whiggism. And at a later period, when Holland House was the centre and rendezvous of the working Whigs—the place where the prospects of the party were talked over and measures from day to day concocted—the severer ratiocination of the party was still transacted in Edinburgh, or at least reserved for the *Edinburgh Review*. How much influence Scotland thus had in modifying the theory of British Whiggism, and moulding the general body of Whig doctrine into its final shape as a fixed political creed, would appear more distinctly if one were to compare the expositions of Whiggism given by the practical English Whigs at the beginning of the present century, with the expositions of it which have become current since it sustained the emphasising stroke of Scottish speculation. Jeffrey was one of the men who contributed most to this result. Indeed, if there is any part of his writings where he shows more than in another that tendency to fundamental propositions in which, as compared with some of his eminent countrymen, we have remarked that he was deficient, it is in his essays on general politics. They are perhaps as deep things as could be written in connection with Whiggism; very much deeper thinking might have parted the connection. Most serviceable and safe in the concrete, or as a rule of political action in troubled times, Whiggism in the abstract, as even Whigs admit, lies so far on this side of the intellectually extreme, that any ambitious gentleman bound for that region must needs go through the other side of it, whether he means to return or not. But Jeffrey was most at home precisely at about the requisite distance from the intellectually extreme, and was, therefore, the very man to do his best scientifically when expounding Whiggism. Take, accordingly, the following passage, which expresses what we firmly believe was Jeffrey's deepest and most enduring conviction in politics:—

"The whole difference between a good and a bad government appears to us to consist in this particular, viz., in the greater or the less facility which it affords for the early, the gradual and steady operation of the substantial power of the community upon its constituted authorities; while the freedom, again, and ultimate happiness of the nation depend on the degree in which the substantial power is possessed by a greater or a smaller, and a more or less moral and instructed part of the whole society—a matter almost independent of the form or name of the government, and determined in a great degree by the progress which the society itself has made in civilization or refinement. . . .

The great point is to ensure a free, an authoritative, and an uninterrupted communication between the ostensible administrators of the national power, and its actual constituents and depositaries; and the chief distinction between a good and a bad government consists in the degree in which it affords the means of such a communication. The main end of government, to be sure, is that wise laws should be enacted and enforced; but such is the condition of human infirmity, that the hazard of sanguinary contentions about the exercise of power is a much greater and more imminent evil than a considerable obstruction in the making or execution of the laws; and the best government, therefore, is not that which promises to make the best laws, and to enforce them most rigorously, but that which guards best against the tremendous conflicts to which all administrations of government, and all exercise of political power are so apt to give rise. It happens, fortunately indeed, that the same arrangements which most effectually ensure the peace of society against those disorders are also, on the whole, the best calculated for the purposes of wise and efficient legislation. But we do not hesitate to look upon the negative or preventive virtues as of a far higher cast than their positive and active ones; and to consider a representative legislature as incomparably of more value when it truly enables the efficient force of the nation to control and direct the executive, than when it merely enacts wholesome statutes in its legislative capacity."—*Review of Leckie's Essay on Government, written in 1821; see Contributions, vol. iii.*

Such is Jeffrey's version of the Whig principle in politics, and there is no principle more frequently reiterated in his writings. Again and again he recurs to it, sometimes expounding it formally, as above, sometimes incidentally referring to it, but always in such a way as to shew the supreme value in which he held it. That in every community there is a class holding the real and substantial power, whoever may be the person or persons in official authority, and on whatever supposed tenure they exercise that authority; that the extent of this class, its proportion to the whole community, as well as its character and composition, varies with the degree of civilization to which the community has attained; that, in every case,

the appropriate constitution is that set of devices which shall bring the opinion of the class who have the power most directly and surely to bear upon those who are in authority; that in England, and other similarly situated countries, where the class who have the power are numerous, and composed of very various elements, the best set of devices for the purpose in question consists in what is called Parliamentary or Representative government; that probably this is the ultimate kind of government attainable by civilized men; and that, in England, therefore, the proper course to be adopted by political reformers is, neither, on the one hand, to quarrel with this form of government, out of any theoretical preference for the supposed social energy of an absolute executive, nor, on the other, to attack the existing form of a Limited Hereditary Monarchy, out of any theoretical preference for the greater logical simplicity of Republicanism, but to keep up continually the play and stroke of the real power upon the recognized executive, by at once and immediately admitting to a share in the representation any new ingredient of real power that time or education may develop, nay, even to foster in the community every tendency to such an extension of the real power throughout the mass of the hitherto unfranchised,—such, stated in the most general terms, was the theory of Whiggism, as propounded by Jeffrey, and as disseminated by his influence through Scotland and England.

Now, of the speculative merit of such a reproduction of the Whig theory there can be but one opinion. Jeffrey here, we believe, did a real feat of Scottish generalization, and assisted political thought for ever by the lucid expression of one stage of it. And in what stead this cardinal notion stood to Jeffrey himself, what clearness and unity of purpose it gave to all his subordinate speculations in social matters, may be seen by a reference to his numerous political and historical sketches. Farther than this, too, it cannot be denied that the notion, in his hands and in those of his Whig associates and disciples, did immense public service. Permeating the whole body of British society, it dissolved and disintegrated much of the remaining national Toryism; and as all the great political achievements of the Whig party, during the generation preceding the present—the Catholic Emancipation, the Abolition of Colonial Slavery, Economical Retrenchment, and the Reform Bill, were logical consequences of the Whig principle in the whole, so they were, doubtless, accelerated by this modification of it. If, however, we lift up the speculation itself by its

roots, and examine how far it is a permanent and all-sufficing generalization in political science, we shall feel that it leaves us still in that condition of mere progress towards a final truth, which our Yankee friends describe by the term of "seekers." It might be shewn, and Jeffrey himself had a glimpse of the fact, that the whole speculation proceeds on the view that government is based on a negation. The historical origin of government, according to Jeffrey, was precisely this, that, in early communities, strong and often unscrupulous individuals grasped at the supreme power, and that the other powerful men in the community made the best terms they could with these individuals, that is, struggled in a rude way to subject the inevitable one authority to the existing multifarious power. Now, whatever truth there may be in this assertion, considered as a fact in the natural history of government, it is clear that, unless something be postulated over the fact—some divine law ordaining and inhering in the fact, however it happened—some *a priori* necessity for the human race of government as such—then all government, from first to last, resolves itself into nothing more than the neutralization of one thing by another thing; of usurpation, direct or inherited, by organized resistance. Jeffrey, we think, would not have accepted this as his belief, if it had been nakedly proposed to him; but that the germs of such a belief lay in his political creed, may be inferred from his explicit statement in the foregoing passage, that he considered the merits of Parliamentary government to consist far less in its energy as an instrumentality for initiating wholesome positive laws, (in which respect, he admits, some have maintained its inferiority to Despotism,) than in its negative virtues as a means of enabling the scattered power of the nation to control its centralized executive. At all events, the belief we mention is the actual conclusion in which those who have carried out Jeffrey's principles to their logical extreme have at length ended. That all government is but an elaborate negation of the right to govern, a complicated equation the result of which is zero, a mere organized system of interferences to neutralize previous interferences; and that, consequently, the whole tendency of civilisation is to abolish Government, and to bring society to that state in which all men and women shall be so many independent self-governed atoms, and society itself a mere aggregate of such—this is the theory now creeping into vogue. Now for such as adopt this theory, Whiggism, whether as expounded by Jeffrey or by any one else, is evidently

too narrow. Political duty, according to them, consists in speeding on the great consummation of No-government to which all things tend; and they are inclined to hold that the way to this is not so much through any rigorous or professed constitutionalism, as through the intervening term of democracy, or even a succession of mutually weakening struggles between democracy and despotism. Against all this another class of thinkers protest. Caring little for researches into the primeval origin of Governments, and assuming that in the modifications which Government has undergone as to form since the days of the Nimrods and the Nebuchadnezzars down to those of the Peels and the Polks, there has doubtless, as everywhere else, been a law of evolution at work, they hold that Government itself is an imperishable necessity of social existence, a specific mode or forthgoing of human energy in the associated state. They hold that society itself has a life and activity, distinct from the lives and activities of the individuals which compose it, involving these but not logically reducible into these; and the manifestations of this general social life they regard as things of supreme import—as, in fact, *the acts of the human race* as such. Governments of all forms, accordingly, they regard as the organs of volition and expression belonging to this higher life of society, the organs whose business it specially is to cogitate at every moment what new step society shall take, what new condition it shall impose upon itself with a view to some end. Hence, instead of preferring those Governments whose excellence is chiefly negative, they are disposed to prefer those which, from their nature, abound most in positive energy—which are the readiest to seize good notions of all kinds, shape them into laws and institutions, and so work them fast up into the condition and circumstances of the people. As to the precise form of Government that would do this best, they are, however, all at sea. It may be asserted that here again, however, there is a manifest tendency to burst the walls of constitutional Whiggism. Jeffrey, indeed, persuaded himself that the form of Government which he preferred for its negative merits might also be shown to be the best in respect of sound legislative energy. But, as the sight becomes more frequent of that wreck of bills which the recess of every Parliamentary session leaves floating up and down in the public limbo, one or two small measures perhaps having been the sole product of many months—the persons in question begin to despair and to look about for new possibilities. Some, as we know, fell back upon the resolute moral

desire as a refuge from the intellectual confusion; and, wishing vehemently for a wise despotism, would almost tolerate a despotism never so foolish. Others, applying themselves with a more sanguine faith to the problem of achieving the desired end without retrogression, scheme out a kind of theocratic democracy of the future, in which peoples, while governing themselves, shall be constantly pervaded by an inventive social energy, and shall to some extent commit the articulate expression of that energy to special social functionaries.

But though men may roam in deserts they must live in houses; and there are many who, though quite competent to such excursions into the regions of the intellectually extreme in politics, and even accustomed to them, still, feeling the necessity of having a roof above their heads against the wind and weather of present fact, return contentedly after every excursion to the comforts of homely Whiggism. Jeffrey himself, as his writings show, had now and then, notwithstanding his practical fidelity to this creed, occasional doubts, and wanderings, and surmises. Towards the end of his life, in particular, it seems to have been with a dazzled and hesitating eye that he looked forward into the increasing ghastliness of the European future. It is indeed a thought-distracting, theory-upsetting, sorrow-inflicting, consistency-killing element—this element of politics and political speculation! Nowhere are fools more dogmatic, nowhere are wise men more sad and silent; nowhere are wise men and fools, folly and wisdom, commingled and confounded more inextricably. Flashes of light through firmaments of darkness; a few strong instinctive convictions, a few leading doctrinal generalities, struggling with a chaos of facts which they cannot organize—such is now the science of politics. The sun may yet shine, and truth and certainty lay claim to this region too; meanwhile men must grope. Hence again we say, it were well if men, without giving themselves political names at all, or at least without setting much store by these names, could consent to view each case as it occurred in the light of its own immediate merits—a so-called Whig now and then, for example, saying a word for what is beautiful in the antique; and a so-called Tory blowing the blast which is to dethrone a tyrant Bomba. Perhaps something of this immediate sensitiveness to right and wrong in themselves, rather than any respect for the Horatian maxim, "*in medio tutissimus*," has been the secret of that moderation of opinion which has distinguished most genial and sagacious men who have been obliged to

take part in politics—the moderate Whiggism of a Jeffrey, on the one hand; and on the other, the moderate Toryism of a Scott. For modern use, indeed, one would be inclined to supplement the Horatian maxim, thus:—*In medio tutissimus ibis; in omnibus tamen rectius ages, si et extrema mediteris.*

It is like passing from the smoke and din of the town to the pure air and quietness of the country to pass from Jeffrey in his connexion with politics, to Jeffrey in his connexion with literature. Here too, we have to note as the first fact with respect to the influence which was exercised, in the person of Jeffrey, over the judgment and the feelings of Britain generally, that that influence, whether favourable or not, was Scottish. As the successive modifications of Whig doctrine during the first thirty years of this century emanated from Edinburgh, so, from the same place, and, in the pages of the same periodical, there issued a more regular, more rapid, more consistent, and more influential series of criticisms on the works of contemporary British authors than from any other place in Great Britain. The *Quarterly* and other Reviews might, in some respects, contest the palm with the *Edinburgh*, in point of literary excellence and ability during the period in question, though even on this head there might be some doubts; but as a critical organ, as a recognised authority in the literary republic for whose quarterly judgments on new books readers waited with interest and authors with trembling, the *Edinburgh* had no competitor. There were both English and Scottish bards at that time, but there were, strictly speaking, only Scotch reviewers. Byron's lines, where he makes the genius of Caledonia address Jeffrey, whom she has just rescued from "Little's leadless pistol," are more than a satire.

"My son," she cried, "ne'er thirst for gore again,
Resign the pistol and resume the pen;
O'er politics and poesy preside,
Boast of thy country and Britannia's pride!
For long as Albion's heedless sons submit,
Or Scottish taste decides on English wit,
So long shall last thine unmolested reign,
Nor any dare to take thy name in vain."

We declare this to be but a satiric myth embodying a real fact. Somewhere about the beginning of the nineteenth century, the genius of Caledonia, residing then with her more buxom and less bony, though somewhat more matronly, sister, the genius of Albion, in the place assigned for the habitation of such entities, *did* meditate another stroke of Scottish emphasis across the general condition of Britain; and *did*, after con-

sulting with her sister, and obtaining her assent, (she was somewhat sleepy and in a very good humour at the time,) speed down to Scotland in search of a Scotchman fit to execute her purpose by becoming a critic of all British literature. She hovered, for some time, uncertain, over the land of her care, now glancing at the Highlands, now at the Lowlands; at last, however, she rested, as was natural, over Edinburgh, and discerned the object of her search in the acute, fluent, penetrating little lawyer, living among his books, and at that very moment, we will suppose, reading one of them to his young wife in their small establishment in Buccleuch Place. She liked him all the better for her purpose, that he had had some experience of an English university, spoke with an English accent, and was, on the whole, of a sweet generous disposition, rather English than Scotch. And so, by agreement between the two sisters, Jeffrey was placed in the chair of British criticism, and called upon to pass his judgments both on English and Scottish authors. Sister Albion has sometimes since, we hear, repented of her share in the arrangement, and had cross words with Caledonia on the subject; but being of the noblest temper, she admits, on the whole, that the arrangement was a good one, and that England as well as Scotland has benefited by it.

One qualification which Jeffrey possessed for the task assigned to him, in a degree greater perhaps than any other Scotchman of that time, was extensive knowledge of, and real delight in, the works which constitute, in their series, the past wealth of English literature. Always fond of quiet domestic leisure, rather than violent modes of exercise, and always a diligent and rapid reader, he had probably gone through as large a course of reading in the standard British authors, as any of his most cultivated English contemporaries. And while our great prose-writers, whether of the more heavy and severe, or of the more light and sparkling style, had had a due share of his attention, he had still revelled with a pleasure which custom never made less, in the richer and more fantastic compositions of the older poets. Shakespeare was almost a boundless enthusiasm with him; Chaucer, Spenser, and Milton shared the second place in his regards; with the poetry of the Elizabethan era he was more than usually familiar; and he admired with a just sense of degree, the strength of Dryden, the wit and polish of Pope, the charming grace of Goldsmith, and the fervid genius of Burns. This familiarity with all varieties of literary beauty, this extensive acquaintance with the au-

thors, who—according to a favourite phrase of his own, of which somehow we are now growing ashamed—are to be regarded as “the best models” of English literature, very soon developed, in a mind naturally both sensitive and shrewd, that peculiar aptitude for at once relishing or disliking anything new in literature, which we designate by the word *taste*. It was the *taste* of Jeffrey that constituted his special accomplishment as a critic: where that was right, he was right; where that was at fault, he was at fault. It was with this taste, the compound result in him of his native powers and tendencies, and his familiar acquaintance with the established “models,” that he came forth to meet the tide of new books which flowed in upon him from all the sources of contemporary British authorship—the Scotts, and Byrons, and Crabbes, and Campbells, and Southey, and Wordsworths of a new and abounding era. His self-appointed task was that he, the Scotchman Jeffrey, should tell of every important new literary composition as it came out, whether he liked it or not, and what passages he liked, and what he did not like in it, and something, also, of his reasons for so liking and disliking. This, and nothing else, was the task which Jeffrey prescribed to himself as a critic.

He performed the task frankly and honestly. By nature the most “sweet-blooded” of creatures, neither malice, nor envy, nor political difference interfered to make him speak ill, where he thought well, of an author. On the other hand, neither private friendship nor political agreement prevented him from expressing a severe opinion where he thought it right to do so. He sent the proof-sheets of one of his most severe reviews of Scott to Scott himself, on the very day he was going to dine with him. Moore, with whom he fought a duel, because Moore chose to construe his remarks on his *Little's Poems* into an accusation of personal profligacy, lived to be his guest at Craigerook, and to sing songs on his lawn. Byron learnt to call him “Dear Jeffrey,” and devoted a stanza of reconciliation to him in one of the cantos of *Don Juan*. And if Southey and Wordsworth never quite forgave him, this was on account of the peculiarity of the case; and the peculiarity was on their side, and not on his. The fact is, that Jeffrey's whole procedure as a critic, his eulogies on some authors, his attacks on others, his praises of one of an author's compositions, his dispraises of other compositions of the same author, his mingled praises and dispraises of one and the same book, all exhibited what was most singularly his qualifi-

education for the task he had assumed—his honest unhesitating reliance on his own taste. When we said some time ago that Jeffrey, like a falcon, looked about him with a sharp, clear, and almost too unbashful eye, what we meant to indicate was precisely this reliance on the competence of his own momentary judgment, this freedom from intellectual diffidence, this exquisite power of pronouncing a thing right or wrong, correct or incorrect, on the mere faith of his own instant sensation of it. Men differ very much in this respect. There are some men, and these often men of real energy and resolution, who possess little or nothing of this unflinching opinionativeness, and who, when a matter is presented to them for the first time, rather take it trustingly as it is given, and let themselves be passively affected by it, than meet it, as it were, at intellectual sword-point. Often, when their opinion is asked, they positively have none to give; and often, when a statement is made to them, in itself perhaps the most questionable in the world, they do not, unless it jars on some specially tender nerve, behave to it dogmatically at all, but seem rather to occupy themselves with pondering the possibilities of it. For example, when the fate of the Crystal Palace was pending, and when the one question in London, which everybody asked of everybody else, was, whether it should be kept up or removed, there were, we believe, many who, though by no means undecided when they *had* an opinion, really had no opinion whatever on this particular matter, and, therefore, could give none. Instantly to form an opinion in such a case, by calculating all the results positive and negative on both sides—all that would happen and all that would not happen if the Palace stood, and all that would happen and all that would not happen if it were taken away—was clearly beyond the powers of the human reason; and not having either the special feelings of an exhibitor to assist a conclusion on one side, or the special feelings of a Hyde Park proprietor to assist a conclusion on the other, they were content to be opinionless, or to listen reverentially to both opinions, or to abominate the whole subject, or perhaps at last to be talked into one of the opinions by others. So also, there are persons who, when anything in art or literature comes before them challenging their admiration, and recommended by high authority, admire it or not, as the case may be; but, if they do not admire it, will often shrink from saying so, not from caution, but from a proneness to fancy that there may be more in the thing than meets the eye. When their feelings are not deeply stirred for or against, their tendency is to be neutral, or if they must speak, to say either what is expected, or, out of revenge, the very reverse. They will even laugh sometimes when they do not see the joke, if only there is testimony to its existence. It was quite different with Jeffrey. He had none of this intellectual bashfulness, which disqualifies for affirming or denying, except on occasions when the affirmation or denial must be vehement and continuous. He met all things at intellectual sword-point, and approved or condemned, right and left, without any hesitation. Possibly his habits as a lawyer may have had something to do with this; the mere practice of criticism, likewise, strengthened the tendency to criticise; but Jeffrey was a critic by nature. Whether in politics or in literature he was ready at once with a distinct and honest judgment whenever he was asked for it. In going over the French Revolution, for example, which he has done once or twice in his political and historical papers, he alternates between praise and dispraise almost as regularly as if he had been a criticising piston; now dwelling with approbation on what he considers a great and splendid act of policy in the leaders of that movement; and again exhibiting some blunder, by which, according to his judgment, the movement was, from the first, vitiated and ruined. And so in his remarks on a novel, a play, or a poem. Generally, his good nature and his real enjoyment of literary excellence, led him to devote most space to the praise, when it was possible to praise at all; but there is also almost invariably an enumeration at the end of blemishes or defects; and sometimes in one and the same page, or even in one and the same sentence, the author is lauded highly for his merits and blamed severely for his faults. This character in your novel is good and natural, that absurd and unnatural; this poem in your collection is beautiful and striking, that tame and mawkish; this image in the verse is highly poetical, that extravagant and obscure:—such, allowing for the larger space usually assigned to the praise, was Jeffrey's invariable mode of addressing the subjects of his criticism. Let us illustrate this by a quotation or two taken at random.

On Byron's Tragedies.—"Considered as poems, we confess they appear to us to be rather heavy, verbose, and inelegant—deficient in the passion and energy which belong to the other writings of the noble author—and still more in the richness of imagery, the originality of thought, and the sweetness of versification for which he used to be distinguished. They are for the most part solemn, prolix, and ostenta-

tious, lengthened out by large preparations for catastrophes which never arrive, and tantalising us with slight specimens and glimpses of a higher interest, scattered thinly up and down many weary pages of declamation. . . . There are some sweet lines and many of great weight and energy; but the general march of the verse is cumbrous and unmusical. His lines do not vibrate like polished lances, at once strong and light, in the hands of his persons, but are wielded like clumsy batons in a bloodless affray. Instead of the graceful familiarity and idiomatical melodies of Shakespeare, they are apt, too, to fall into clumsy prose in their approaches to the easy and colloquial style; and, in the loftier passages, are occasionally deformed by low and common images that harmonize but ill with the general solemnity of the diction."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1822.

On Scott's Lay of the Last Minstrel.—"From the various extracts we have now given our readers will be enabled to form a tolerably correct judgment of this poem; and if they are pleased with those portions of it which have now been exhibited, we may venture to assure them that they will not be disappointed by the perusal of the whole. The whole night journey to Delorane, the opening of the wizard's tomb, the march of the English battle, and the parley before the walls of the castle, are all executed with the same spirit and poetical energy which we think is conspicuous in the specimens we have already extracted, and a great variety of short passages occur in every part of the poem, which are still more striking and meritorious, though it is impossible to detach them, without injury, in the form of a quotation. . . . There are many passages, as we have already insinuated, which have the general character of heaviness, such as the minstrel's account of his preceptor and Delorane's lamentation over the dead body of Musgrave. But the goblin page is, in our opinion, the capital deformity of the poem. We have already said that the whole machinery is useless; but the magic studies of the lady, and the rifled tomb of Michael Scott, give occasion to such admirable poetry that we can, on no account, consent to part with them. The page, on the other hand, is a perpetual burden to the poet and to the reader; it is an undignified and improbable fiction, which excites neither terror, admiration, nor astonishment, but needlessly debases the strain of the whole work, and excites at once our incredulity and contempt."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1805.

On Keats's Poems.—"We had never happened to see either of these volumes till very lately, and have been exceedingly struck with the genius they display and the spirit of poetry which breathes through all their extravagance. . . . They are full of extravagance and irregularity, rash attempts at originality, interminable wanderings, and excessive obscurity. . . . But they are flushed all over with the rich lights of fancy, and so coloured and bestrewn with the flowers of poetry, that even when perplexed and bewildered in their labyrinths it is impossible to resist the intoxication of their sweetness, or to shut our hearts to the enchantments they so lavishly present.

. . . The thin and scanty tissue of his story (*Endymion*) is merely the light framework on which his florid wreaths are suspended; and while his imaginations go rambling and entangling themselves everywhere, like wild honey-suckles, all idea of sober reason, and plan, and consistency, is utterly forgotten and 'strangled in their waste fertility.' A great part of the work, indeed, is written in the strangest and most fantastical manner that can be imagined. It seems as if the author had ventured everything that had occurred to him in the shape of a glittering image or striking expression—taken the first word that presented itself to make up a rhyme and then made that word the germ of a new cluster of images—a hint for a new excursion of the fancy—and so wandered on, equally forgetful whence he came and heedless whither he was going, till he had covered his pages with an interminable arabesque of connected and incongruous figures, that multiplied as they extended, and were only harmonized by the brightness of their tints and the graces of their forms. In this rash and headlong career he has, of course, many lapses and failures. There is no work, accordingly, from which a malicious critic could cull more matter for ridicule, or select more obscure, unnatural, or absurd passages. But it is, in truth, at least as full of genius as of absurdity."—*Edinburgh Review*, 1820.

On a Number of Dickens's Copperfield.—"Bless you, my dear Dickens, and happy new-years for centuries to you and yours! A thousand thanks for your kind letter of December, and for your sweet, soothing *Copperfield* of the new-year. It is not a hinging or marking chapter in the story of the Life, but it is full of good matter, and we are all the better for it. The scene with Agnes is the most impressive, though there is much promise in Traddles. Uriah is too disgusting; and I confess I should have been contented to have heard no more of the Micawbers. But there is no saying what you may make of them."—*Letter to Mr. Dickens*, Jan. 6, 1805.—*Lord Cockburn's Life*, vol. ii. pp. 464, 465.

These extracts, though, with the exception of that on Keats, which is really a fine piece of meaning finely expressed, they do not illustrate sufficiently Jeffrey's powers as a writer—the delicacy and tact of his discrimination, his clear and genial wit, and his happy fluency in choice and garnished and lightly moving phrases—yet convey an exact and adequate idea of his manner as a critic. The "beauty and blemish principle," if we may so express it, was the principle of criticism in the application of which to the writings of his day Jeffrey was a master. To point out the special beauties of a poem or novel, to append or interweave an enumeration of the special blemishes, and to illustrate both by ample and appropriate extracts—this was the standing formula according to which almost all the critical papers in the *Edinburgh Review* were

written, during the editorship of Jeffrey. It was the organ for telling society at large, and ladies and gentlemen of taste in particular, what they were to think of the last new books. It performed on the large scale, and with a kind of princely decisiveness to which there is nothing now comparable, that important social function which smaller periodicals now attempt to discharge, when, for example, they consult public convenience by answering, *ex cathedra*, the question so often put at private parties, "What do you think of the new number of *Bleak House*?" As readers of the present day, and especially those unopinionative readers who are apt to take *Bleak House* or anything else as it comes, without making up their minds in any distinct manner as to its merits or demerits, owe a debt of gratitude to the smaller periodicals which point these out; so, in the first quarter of this century, and in a degree a hundred times greater, were readers indebted to the *Edinburgh Review*. To pronounce judgments on new books and to disseminate Whig principles, were the two professed ends of the Review; and as its fidelity to the one end was undoubted, so no one could deny the vigilance with which it attended to the other.

It is a known fact, however, exemplified nowhere more conspicuously than in the progress of the *Edinburgh Review* itself, that the sketchy "beauty and blemish" species of criticism in which Jeffrey excelled, has now passed out of date, and been succeeded, at least in all our higher periodicals, by a kind of criticism intrinsically deeper and more laborious. Partly by reason of that enormous increase of books which has made it a physical necessity to devolve the task of general literary censorship upon the weekly periodicals, and even on the daily newspapers; partly by reason of the rise among us of an altogether higher sense of what criticism is, or may be—the papers which now constitute the staple of our magazines and quarterlies are of a kind of which similar periodicals in older times exhibit few or no examples. It is not, perhaps, at least it is not in all cases, that there is greater positive ability than formerly in those who betake themselves to this species of writing—for it would be no easy thing to find a person in any class or any profession with a greater fund of talent available for any purpose whatever than existed in Jeffrey; it is that the new principle which usage has, since Jeffrey's time, established in the art of periodical writing, compels those who betake themselves to it, be their abilities what they may, to task these abilities harder. Merely to note the beauties and blemishes of a new

book, or the merits and defects of a known author in that rapid superficial way which enables the public to say whether the book or author has been noticed favourably or otherwise, is not now the business of a critic in the Quarterlies. What is usually required of him is, either some original disquisition, for which a book or a certain number of books may furnish the test; or some critical appreciation of a new intellectual tendency running through simultaneous scores of books, several of which are named by way of specimen; or, some thorough dissection of an important new book, considered as a product of a peculiar mode of thought exhibited nowhere else; or, lastly, and perhaps most frequently, some elaborate literary monograph, or study of character, in which the attempt is made to delineate in exact portraiture the features of some representative man, and to trace the stamp of these in his writings or the circumstances of his life. It is needless, in illustration of this change in the nature of our periodical literature, to do more than allude to those occasional essays of Macaulay and Carlyle, which, if they did not assist to bring about the change, at least mark, in a very striking manner, that a change has taken place. Side by side with the republished contributions of these and some later writers to our periodical literature, Jeffrey's reprinted criticisms appear slight and ephemeral. The truth is, that his literary criticisms rank lower, in point of thought or permanent intellectual contents, than his political articles. In these articles, as we have seen, there is often a marked tendency to general speculation, a successful effort to reach a scientific principle. There is far less of this in his literary criticisms. General disquisition, indeed, is not wanting, and leading canons of taste are duly implied or laid down; but, on the whole, the papers have the appearance of light things dashed off on the "beauty and blemish" principle, by a brilliant and happy writer, whose simple business it was to read new books and tell the public frankly what he thought of them. Considered as such, however—as criticisms of the hour—as the applications of one man's taste and judgment, sometimes in the form of reproof and chastisement, to the whole current literature of his generation—we have no series of criticisms approaching to them in merit. Jeffrey, in this sense, was truly the king of critics. If he has not left behind him more solid monuments of his own literary genius, it is because, like a true king, he occupied himself so assiduously with the task of governing and controlling—of administering, as it were, day by day, portions

of his individuality into the course of affairs as they were. That, while performing this task so well, he was able at the same time to sustain the character of being himself a fine and graceful writer, is so much merit in addition. Slight as the texture of Jeffrey's criticisms is, there are passages in them of such happy and ingenious and even rich and eloquent expression, that no series of "Elegant Extracts" would now be complete that did not contain specimens from them, as a recognised portion of our classic British literature.

Whatever may be thought of the *depth* of Jeffrey's criticisms, it must be allowed that, on the whole, they were singularly *just*. There have been, we imagine, very few men so courageous in giving opinions on things, whose opinions on things could be more fully trusted, when given. Even his critical observations on historical transactions, so distant and difficult to appreciate as those of the first French Revolution, were probably as sound as it was possible for critical observations of that nature to be. And his literary criticisms, for the most part, stand good even yet. The opinions pronounced by Jeffrey thirty or forty years ago on the works of Scott, Byron, Campbell, Crabbe, Moore, Keats, Rogers, and all the other literary chiefs of that period, are, for the most part, the opinions that people hold on the same works now; and some of the very phrases which Jeffrey used to describe his impressions as to what was characteristic in these writers, have now all the sanction of prescriptive usage. Lord Cockburn is very decided upon this point. "What poet," he asks, "whom Jeffrey condemns, continues a favourite with the public, except in the works, or in the passages, or in the qualities which he applauds?" We cannot, however, go *quite* so far as Lord Cockburn when he says this. Although Jeffrey's judgments on the poets and other writers of his time were, on the whole, as accurate as they were frank, there *are* cases in which the public has found it necessary to leave him and his criticisms far behind. Every man has his natural limitations; and there are things contemporary with every man, according to external appearance, which properly are *not* contemporary with him, but indicate preparations by nature for the future, and her tendency towards what shall be in vigor and flourish when he shall have passed away. Jeffrey, by nature, had probably more of sympathy with what was fine, and exquisite, and pathetic in literature, in its already established forms, than with what, either in thought or in method, proposed an innovation; and although the range of his intel-

lectual appreciation was large when he directed his attention to the past, there were deep tendencies of his own time towards which, with a pertinacity which at once gave the measure of his intelligence, and showed its strength within that measure, he remained entirely negative. It is needless to do more than allude, in illustration of this, to his criticism on Goethe in connexion with the novel of *Wilhelm Meister*, and to his long series of attacks on Wordsworth and the Lake Poets. The "This will never do" which, in both these cases, was substantially his critical verdict, can now only be regarded as an interesting example of the old in literature perturbed by the approach of the new. There are of course persons yet amongst us to whom Jeffrey's verdict in those cases seems still the right one; but for all who properly belong to our epoch, the question has been long ago ended.

The truth is, a new spirit in literature, as well as in other things, was taking possession of the age as Jeffrey passed away from it. Influences akin to those which Jeffrey resisted in his attacks on Coleridge and Wordsworth, streamed in on the mind of Britain from all sides; and before Jeffrey died he saw a very changed world. From the peaceful retreat at Craigcrook, where he spent his declining years, leading in the circle of his private friends that kindly, and sociable, and pensive home-life, of which Lord Cockburn has told us too little, but of which we obtain some beautiful and charming glimpses from his own letters, Jeffrey must have looked out with mingled feelings of surprise, admiration, and regret upon the tide of new things that time and labour were evoking all around him. In politics, a new French Revolution, a whole continent once more defying despotism, and speculations of far deeper colour than the authentic old buff and blue, came in the end to assure him—more profoundly and convincingly perhaps than he had been assured before—that men will not suffer Whiggism to be the final formula in political science. And in literature, he stood at last like a Nestor amid the warriors of a second and third generation. The Scotts, the Byrons, the Campbells, the Crabbes, the Coleridges, the Southseys, the Moores, the Mackintoshes, and the Rogerses, who were properly his contemporaries, had either passed away or taken out their superannuation; Wordsworth, whom he had attacked, was the poet-patriarch of England, removed high beyond all critical reach; the power and the glory of British literature had passed to chiefs trained within the periods of his own activ-

ity—the Wilsons, and Carlyles, and Hunts, and Landors, and Macaulays, and Brewsters, and Stephens, and Hamiltons, who still live and labour among us; year after year a new name, such as that of Bulwer, or Isaac Tay-loy, or Dickens, or Thackeray, or Jerrold, or Tennyson, or Robert Chambers, or Hugh Miller, or John Mill, was added, before his eyes, to the list of our men of intellectual and literary eminence; and as he looked still farther along the series for what was appearing or about to be, he could discern, as of greater or less note, and of various promise, in a generation still younger, such men as Stanley, and Ruskin, and Samuel Brown, and Wilkinson, and George Wilson, and Marston, and Lewes, and Aytoun, and Kingsley, and Browning, and Patmore. Genial, and lively, and sympathetic as he was, he saw all this with a kindly and genuine interest, and with the readiest approbation of whatever was good and beautiful. “Oh, my dear, dear Dickens!” he writes, after the receipt of one of the Numbers of *Dombey*, “what a No. 5 you have given us! I have so cried and sobbed over it last night, and again this morning; and felt my heart purified by those tears, and blessed and loved you for making me shed them, and I never can bless and love you enough.” The heart that could feel so for the death of Paul Dombey had clearly lost none of its susceptibility to the charms of fine literature. But the pathos of *Dombey* is not in the spirit of the age; and at the time when Jeffrey wrote these words, he cannot but have felt that *his* day was in the past, and that it had fallen to men very different from himself to do the work required by the new time.

Jeffrey, as all know, has not been the last representative of Scottish influence in British literature. He is not to be regarded as holding even the penultimate or the ante-penultimate place in the series of eminent Scotchmen. Chalmers and Carlyle properly come after him; Sir William Hamilton, in the field of metaphysics, more than maintains, at this very day, the ancient honors of his country; in Hugh Miller, Scotland has still a son, with features peculiarly her own, of whose manly heart, and of whose deeds in literature, any country might be proud; and even in Jeffrey's own field of literary criticism, have we not had, since Jeffrey's time, a totally different display of the Scottish genius in Christopher North and *Blackwood's Magazine*? Scottish emphasis still reigns and works as a specific element in all British thought, all British activity, and all British literature. Nay, and there will still be stroke after stroke of Scottish emphasis

till Scotland shall be no more, or till all things having been finally and for ever co-ordinated, the necessity for emphasis shall cease. But nature abhors repetitions, and every new stroke of Scottish emphasis must tell athwart British society as an impulse different in kind from all that preceded it. And so more particularly, with whatever Scotland may yet undertake in the field of literary criticism. The *Edinburgh Review*, it is true, has ceased to be, in any distinctive manner, a Scottish periodical; but Scotland, we believe, may still have, and still needs to have, a periodical of her own. Let us not be mistaken; we speak in no spirit of vain ultra-Scotticism. While it will necessarily, we believe, be the function of such a periodical, with respect to England, to emphasise certain things which it is given to Scotchmen rather than Englishmen at the present day to know and to appreciate; it will necessarily, we believe, be its function, with respect to Scotland, to make war on the excesses of emphasis itself, to attack bad emphasis, and to teach, by manifold allusion to what exists so splendidly in England, the beauty and grandeur of that character which accepts all things in mild and harmonious co-ordination.

-
- ART. II.—1. *The Birds of Australia*. By JOHN GOULD, F.R.S., &c. 7 vols. imp. folio. London, 1848.
2. *An Introduction to the Birds of Australia*. By the Same. 1 vol. 8vo. London, 1848.
3. *The Natural History of Ireland: Birds*. By WILLIAM THOMPSON, Esq., President of the Natural History and Philosophical Society of Belfast. 3 vols. 8vo. London, 1849-51.*

* We have recently observed, with most unfeigned regret, an announcement of Mr. Thompson's death. His removal in the prime of his days from this earthly scene is alike a deep distress to his numerous personal friends, and an irreparable loss to our knowledge of the natural history of his native country, of which he was the chief exponent, and on every branch of which it is known that he had accumulated large and most valuable materials, almost ready for the press. The work named above, on the “Birds of Ireland,” had been fortunately completed by the publication of the third volume. He is, besides, the author of numerous papers in the “Annals of Natural History,” and of an excellent “Report on the Fauna of Ireland,” drawn up at the request of the British Association, and published in their volume for 1840.

Since writing the above note we have taken occasion to abridge the following particulars from an Irish newspaper, kindly transmitted to us by Mr.

THERE is no division of the animal kingdom more richly stored with numerous and diversified species, than the class of Birds. There is none more worthy of our careful study and admiration, whether we regard the wonders of their internal structure, or the beauty of their external aspect. The chaste blending of simple and subdued colours in some, the more showy and sumptuous adornment of others, cannot but be looked on with delight: while that perfect and pervading conformity of organization to the instinctive habits of each particular tribe, so conspicuous throughout the "manifold works" of the great Creator, is in none more plainly and pleasingly exhibited than among the now almost countless varieties of the feathered race. Birds are, moreover, the only beings which please the ear no less than they delight the eye. Bees hum, oxen bellow, and dogs bark, and many other creatures—man and beast—not seldom favour us with most discordant sounds, which each perchance may deem a "joyful noise;"—but listen to the rich outpouring of the mel-

low blackbird's song, or that unwearied thrush on topmost branch of some aspiring tree,

"Making sweet music out of air as sweet,"

from early morning until latest eve, and no doubt is felt that these rejoicing lays are not only cheering to the bright creatures themselves, and their beloved companions brooding unseen amid the leafy arbours, but in glad accordance with all the other harmonies of nature by which they are surrounded on this fair earth.

We need scarcely remark that Ornithology in general now presents a field so vast and varied, that the space required to exhibit even the most cursory and superficial sketch of its existing condition, viewed in all its branches, would greatly exceed the ordinary limits of a Review, even although the present Number should consist entirely of one Article, and that devoted to the feathered tribes. We must, therefore, only touch the subject slightly here and there.

The progress of Ornithology in modern times, taking a merely numerical view of the matter, may be judged of from the following brief record. The first edition of Linnaeus's great work, the *Systema Naturæ*—(which if it did not originate certainly gave universality to the convenient *binominal* system now in use)—was published in 1735. It consisted, so far as birds are concerned, of 47 genera, containing 117 species. In the subsequent editions various genera and species were added,—the former, in the year 1766, amounting to 104, the latter to 947. Latham, the most voluminous of our own ornithological writers, scarcely concerned himself about the formation of genera, but (in 1799) he described 2951 species. More recent writers have devoted themselves chiefly to the description of new species, and the formation or indication of generic groups, justly regarding the accurate compilation of a general system of Ornithology, from the multiplied masses of the feathered tribes, and the scattered condition of their records, as a very fearful task. Thus, the Prince of Canino (C. L. Bonaparte), in 1831, gives us 561 genera, while Mr. Swainson, a few years thereafter (1837), raises the number to 623, of which not fewer than 239 bear designations not formerly in use. The increase of *species* is not so easily ascertained, from the want of works professedly treating of the entire class of birds, but M. Vieillot, in 1823, indicated 3828 species, and C. L. Bonaparte, in 1831, 4099 species. It is well known that Linnaeus had it not in his power, in consequence of his restricted intercourse with foreign lands, to acquire any intimate knowledge of the natural habits or

Thompson's attached friend and fellow-labourer, Robert Patterson, Esq., of Belfast, himself an able and well-known naturalist, author of a most excellent and useful "Introduction to Zoology, for the Use of Schools," and other works. Mr. Thompson was born at Belfast, on the 2d of November 1805. At an early age he became so captivated by those pure enjoyments which spring from the contemplation of nature, that he thenceforward devoted the greater portion of his time to the pursuits of natural history. Applying himself alike to the studious acquirement of recorded knowledge as contained in books, and to a searching and assiduous investigation of the great "*Biblia Naturæ*," he eventually became both a thorough master of the one, and a most skillful interpreter of the other. With the leading naturalists of the day he kept up a constant correspondence, and from time to time he published the results of his own investigations in various scientific journals. The principal writers on the natural history of the British Islands acknowledged themselves indebted to Mr. Thompson for most of their information regarding Ireland. He was a zealous supporter of the British Association, and cheerfully fulfilled, in succession, the duties of almost every honorary office connected with it. A continuation and completion of the "Report" above referred to was one of those contributions which Mr. Thompson had in view to lay before the meeting of the Association to be held in Belfast, during the current year. But alas! how vain and uncertain do we often find our prospective plans. The manuscript of the remainder of the "*Natural History of Ireland*" is, we understand, in a forward state; and we are happy to learn that the author had made arrangements for its publication, under the superintendence of two of his personal friends. Mr. Thompson had proceeded to London in the course of the present spring, to assist in making preparations for the ensuing meeting of the British Association; and having accomplished his mission he was about to return home. But he became unwell in London, and after a short illness, his premature and most deeply lamented death took place there on the 17th day of February last. See *The Mercantile Journal and Statistical Register* (of Belfast), for 30th March 1852.

modes of life of the great majority of his species, and that he placed them in approximation, as he best could, in conformity with their leading external characters. Had he known their habits of life, and connected these with the nicer organic distinctions which he—the Lynx-eyed—no doubt perceived, but generically disregarded, he would certainly not have arranged his species in so few and such far-spread groups. "What might have been the number of his genera," says Mr. J. R. Gray, "had he acquired the knowledge of the vast number of species which are now known, it is not easy to conjecture, except by taking his ratio of species to genera, in comparison with those now given by authors. For example, he had in his last edition, 947 species, divided into 104 genera, so that that there were about 9 species to each genus. There are now known and acknowledged by naturalists about 6000 species. If we divide these into 800 genera, it will give to each genus an average of $7\frac{1}{2}$ species, which is not much under the number given by Linnæus." The preceding intimation given by Mr. J. R. Gray, (certainly one of our most competent authorities,) of the ascertained existence of 800 genera and 6000 species of birds was made in 1841.* We need scarcely say that great additions have been made in the course of the ten years which have since elapsed.

When we take a survey of the attributes of birds, and consider the *dimensions* of the flying species, (from which we exclude the ostrich, and other *Struthious* kinds) we shall find, that if not the largest, at least the longest winged, is represented by the Condor of South America (*Sarcoramphus gryphus*). On the other hand, the smallest is a species of humming bird (*Mellisuga minima*), found in Jamaica. We do not happen to know the weight of a heavy full-grown Condor, but its extended wings measure nearly fifteen feet from tip to tip. The least of all humming birds is scarcely the size of a humble bee, but its wings are long in proportion, like those of a little insect of the hawk-moth kind. Both condors and humming birds are observed at great heights. The former are often seen so high in the air as to appear like scarcely discernible specks, sweeping around in great circles. The ascertained height was on one occasion found by Humboldt to be 23,270 feet; but there is no reason to suppose that that was a neces-

sary approximation to the limit, observations in this kind having been hitherto few and casual, and the ongoing, or rather upgoings, of nature, for the most part unrecorded amid the Alpine solitudes of the Andes. If this wide-winged bird, as is likely, actually soars beyond our power of vision, we can then, of course, only surmise to what elevation it may attain when raised so far above

"The earthquake-rifted mountains of bright snow."

It is, no doubt, of all the living creatures upon earth the one which can remove the farthest from it. The *terrestrial* localities of this gigantic bird are comprised in a zone which extends from about 1000 to 19,000 feet above the sea, and the height at which it habitually soars is, according to Humboldt, six times that at which clouds are suspended over the plains of Europe. When searching for food, it descends to the plains which border the bases of the Cordilleras; and Humboldt has called attention to the remarkable physiological fact, that the same individual which breathes so easily the rarified air of the loftiest regions, should sometimes suddenly descend to the sea-shore, thus passing rapidly through all climates, and every condition of atmosphere. It was formerly believed, in connexion with experimental observations on the air-pump, that no creature could exist under so low a pressure; but it is now known that the species in question breathes as freely when the barometer would indicate only thirteen inches as if it stood at thirty.* Its most frequent haunts range from 10,000 to 19,000 feet above the sea. These lofty regions are known vernacularly by the name of Condor nests, although the female is believed to lay her eggs upon the arid rock. There, perched in dreary solitude, on the crests of scattered peaks, at the very verge of the region of perpetual snow, these dark gigantic birds are seen silently reposing like melancholy spectres. But however wild and savage may be their haunts and habits, the tales narrated of their carrying off young persons of ten or twelve years of age may be regarded as fabulous by any one who has examined their feet and talons, which, though long, and in some respects powerful, are but

* Preface to *Genera of Birds*, 2d edition. In a recent note from Mr. Gould, that active and assiduous ornithologist informs us that the number of British birds now known is about 350; of European, about 500; while the total number ascertained may be stated at 7000.

* We may here note, in respect to Humming birds, that these frail creatures, as represented by one or other of their forms, extend from Terra del Fuego to beyond the sixty-first degree of north latitude. In regard to height, they were seen by Von Tschudi at an elevation of 14,600 feet. *Fauna Peruana*. Ornithol., p. 12. The West Indian Islands and warmer portions of South America, may, however, be regarded as the central region of Humming birds in general.

slightly curved. There is scarcely an authenticated instance of their assaulting even a child.*

Some curious information regarding Condors is given by Sir Francis Head. One of his companions seeing an enormous bird upon a dead horse, rode up to it, and finding the creature so gorged that it could scarcely fly, he suddenly seized it by the neck :

"No two animals can well be imagined less likely to meet than a Cornish miner and a Condor, and few would have calculated, a year ago, when the one was hovering high above the snowy pinnacles of the Cordilleras, and the other many fathoms beneath the surface of the ground in Cornwall, that they would ever meet to wrestle and 'hug' upon the wide desert plain of Villa Vicencia."†

After a hard struggle, and some dubiety as to the result, the Cornish man prevailed, and slew the Condor.

The latitudinal distribution of this noted bird, though widely spread, is yet confined within certain limits, and seems to be regulated by the existence of mountain crests of great elevation. It extends southwards from the Equator to the Straits of Magellan, a range of more than fifty degrees; but it does not appear to spread northwards from the Equator into New Grenada, beyond the province of Antioquia, in the seventh degree. One of its last great resting places is, probably, the Peak of Tolima, which, nearly five degrees north of the Line, rises to an elevation of more than 18,000 feet—sufficient to satisfy the ambition of the most aspiring Condor.

Humboldt is of opinion that next to the Condor, the largest of flying birds is the Lammergeyer of the European Alps (*Gypaetos barbatus*). We doubt not that it is one of the most expanded, in regard to stretch of wing, from tip to tip, but it is by no means a *ponderous* species, being short-legged and somewhat slender-bodied, with a kite-like aspect, and certainly less bulky than the great Harpy Eagle of South America, (*Falco destructor*.) We incline to think that a full-sized female Sea Eagle of our own shores would outweigh it. The great marine species of Eastern Asia (*Haliaetus pelagicus*) assuredly does so. We are also of opinion that the illustrious Prussian naturalist has entirely overlooked the *Palmipedes*, or swimming birds, which possibly present us with the largest of all the winged species. A well-fed Cygnet will weigh nearly thirty pounds, and so it may be doubted if any accipitrine bird, except the Condor,

would not kick the beam, when placed in the balance with a Swan of the largest size. Even as regards expanse from tip to tip of wing, few species of either land or sea exceed, or even equal, the Albatross.

In regard to the geographical distribution of birds, the most remarkable example of a widely extended, we may say of an almost unlimited range, with which we are acquainted, is that of a small shore-bird, called the Turnstone, *Tringa* (or *Strepsilas*) *interpres*. It is a well-known visitant of Britain, is supposed to breed in Shetland, and is known to do so along the shores of the Arctic Circle. Its nest was found by Mr. Hewitson on rocky islets off the coast of Norway, placed against a ledge, and consisting of nothing more than the shed leaves of the juniper, under a creeping branch of which, the eggs, four in number, were "snugly concealed, and admirably sheltered from the many storms by which those bleak and exposed rocks are visited, allowing just sufficient room for the bird to cover them."* Although widely spread, as a migratory species, along the shores of the nearer continent, its extra-European range is quite extraordinary. In the New World it was found by Sir John Richardson in Hudson's Bay, and is known to extend northwards along the icy shores of the Arctic Circle as far as the seventy-fifth parallel, while Mr. Darwin (we pass over many intermediate stations) obtained specimens from the Straits of Magellan. Sir William Jardine has received it from Tobago. It has been seen in Madeira, and is spread along the northern and western coasts of Africa, and onwards to the Cape of Good Hope. It is a well-known Indian species,† occurs also in China and Japan, and is distributed among the great Asiatic islands, such as Java, Sumatra, the Moluccas, and New Guinea. Lastly, it was found in New Holland by Mr. Gould. Now there is nothing in the structure of this species to explain, or in any way account for, its apparently universal distribution over all the four quarters of the globe, and the distant islands of the sea. It possesses no powers of flight which are not equally shared by

* This choice of a rocky foundation on which to place its nest, may, of course, be modified by circumstances, but it is well to know the fact from actual observation. In most of our ordinary compiled works it is otherwise stated. Professor Savi, for example, makes the Turnstone hollow out for itself a little excavation in the sand:—"Scava una piccola buca nell' arena" (*Ornitologia Toscana*, ii. 261); and a like process is referred to by Schinz in his *Hist. Nat. des Nids*, p. 4.

† It was found by Mr. Jerdan at a singular distance from the sea—"At the Tank of Jaulnah, two hundred miles inland, and as far southward as Madras."—*Madras Journal of Science*, July 1840, p. 211.

* Nuttall's *Manual of Ornithology*, vol. i. p. 36.

† *Rough Notes across the Pampas*.

several thousand of its fellow-creatures; and there are no peculiar attributes of its nature, from which we could at all infer, *à priori*, its occurrence under such an extraordinary diversity of clime and country. Whatever the cause, it may assuredly be regarded as the most truly cosmopolite of the feathered race. It is the only species, so far as we know, which occurs in Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia.* It is the only New Holland bird that is found also in Great Britain, and we know of but two others in Europe, both shore-birds,—*Terekia cinerea*, (a kind of Godwit,) and *Totanus stagnatilis*, (allied to the Redshanks,) which are likewise native to New Holland. We may mention that our common Dublin, or sand-piper, (*Tringa cinclus*,) occurs in Europe, Asia, Africa, and America, the West Indies, and the great islands of the Indian Ocean, but not in Australia. It was found by our Arctic voyagers in Melville Peninsula, and has been received by M. Temminck from the island of Timor. It would thus appear, in respect to the dispersion of birds, that species of the Grallatorial order have the greatest range.

There are, however, many other instances of a wide, though not equally extended distribution. It is long since the Prince of Canino made us acquainted with the ornithological relationship of Europe and North America. He shewed that of the 503 species which were then (1838) supposed to constitute the ornithology of Europe, 100 species also occurred in America; while the American species consisted of 471, including the 100 species which it had in common with Europe.†

One of the most singular features, in a view of foreign ornithology, is what may be called the *representative system*, that is, the occurrence of species closely resembling, though not identical with, our more familiar forms. Thus, when the birds of New Holland began to attract attention, the British or European Osprey (*Pandion haliaetus*) was supposed to occur among them. A more minute and accurate examination shewed it to be distinct, but so nearly allied both in structure and habits, as to be *repre-*

sentative of our own species. So likewise with our Icelandic and Peregrine Falcons. Neither of them exists in New Holland, but the former is represented there by *Falco hypoleucos*, the latter by *Falco melanogenys*. Even the North American Peregrine, which might more naturally be thought identical with that of Europe, from so many other points of ornithological agreement between the two countries, has now been set apart as a distinct though representative species, under the name of Duck-hawk—*Falco anatum*. It is a notable fact in regard to this last mentioned bird, (the Peregrine,) that it occurs either actually or by representation, in almost all countries, that is, over a great extent of Europe, Asia, North America, Cape of Good Hope and New Holland. We agree, however, with the Prince of Canino and Professor Kaup, that these so called local varieties are not identical.* The Curlew and its cousin-german the Whimbrel, are curiously and closely represented in New Holland by *Numenius Australis* and *Num. uropygialis*. The same may be said of several other species. Europe and Australia have each a stilted Plover, a Dotterel, and an Avocet, but the species are not identical in the two countries.†

Although so many marked examples of this representative system occur in the far Southern Continent, (as we may call New Holland,) probably no country possesses so many generic groups peculiar to itself. It is also wonderfully rich in species of the most charmingly diversified form and plumage, and remarkable, many of them, for their curious and uncommon instincts. As the result of Mr. Gould's most laborious and equally successful investigations, we have been for some time acquainted with 636 species of birds from New Holland, including Van Dieman's Land. This is more than twice the number known not many years ago, when that intelligent and enterprising naturalist commenced his labours.

"Upon taking a general view of the Australian Ornithology," Mr. Gould remarks, "we find no species of vulture,‡ only one typical eagle, and indeed a remarkable deficiency in the number of the species of its birds of prey, with the exception of the nocturnal owls, among which the species belonging to the restricted

* An Irish ornithologist is said to have remarked on the discovery of the Turnstone in New Holland, that it was now known in the *fifth quarter* of the globe.

† See the following works by Charles Lucien Bonaparte, (then) Prince of Musignano:—*Specchio comparativo delle Ornitologie di Roma e di Filadelfia*, in the 33d No. of the *Nuovo Giornale de' Letterati*, reprinted apart at Pisa, 1827; *Supplemento alla specchio comparativo*, &c., *ibid.* 1832; *A Geographical and Comparative List of the Birds of Europe and North America*, London, 1838; *Catalogo metodico degli uccelli Europei*, Bologna, 1842.

* See Kaup, in *Isis*, (for 1847,) p. 75.

† See Gould's *Introduction to the Birds of Australia*, p. 11.

‡ We agree in this opinion with Mr. Gould. The so called New Holland vulture of Latham, is a rasorial or gallinaceous bird of a very anomalous kind, but in no way allied to the Vulturidæ, although Mr. Swainson considers it as the *rasorial type* of that flesh-eating family. We shall afterwards notice it under the name of *Wattled Tallegalla*.

genus *Strix*, are more numerous than in any other part of the world; a circumstance which is probably attributable to the great abundance of small quadrupeds, most of which are nocturnal in their habits.

"Among the perching birds there is a great excess of the *Insectivoræ*, *Podargi*, *Meliphagidæ*, *Maluridæ*, *Gymnorhinæ*, &c., of the *Granivoræ*, such as various species of the *Fringillidæ*, and of the *Psittacidæ* (or parrots). The latter tribe of birds is more numerous in Australia than in any other part of the world, and forms four great groups, viz., the *Calyptorhynchi*, which mainly procure their food from the *Banksiæ*, *Casuarinæ*, and *Eucalypti*,—the *Cacatue*, which feed upon the terrestrial *Orchidæ*, &c.—the *Trichoglossi*, which subsist upon the nectar they extract from the flower-cups and blossoms of the *Eucalypti*,—and the ground and grass *Parakeets*, which feed almost exclusively on the seeds of the various grasses that abound on the plains; the united groups amounting to nearly sixty species.

"Of the rasorial forms, while the pigeons and hemipods are numerous, the larger typical *Gallinaceæ* are entirely wanting; their only representative being a few species of *Coturnix* and *Synoicus*. The *Grallatorial* birds are about equal in number to those of other countries; and among the water birds the true ducks are but few, while the *Procellariidæ* which visit the coast are in much greater abundance than in any other part of the world. On a retrospect of the whole we find a greater number of nocturnal birds than is comprised in the Ornithology of any other section of the globe. I must not omit to mention too the extraordinary fecundity which prevails in Australia, many of its smaller birds breeding three or four times in a season: but laying fewer eggs in the early spring when insect life is less developed, and a greater number later in the season, when the supply of insect food has become more abundant. I have also some reason to believe that the young of many species breed during the first season, for, among others, I frequently found one section of the honey-eaters (the *Melithrepti*) sitting upon eggs while still clothed in the brown dress of immaturity; and we know that such is the case with the introduced *Gallinaceæ* (or poultry), three or four generations of which have been often produced in the course of a year.

"Another peculiar feature connected with the Australian Ornithology is that of its comprising several forms endowed with the power of sustaining and enjoying life without a supply of water, that element without which most others languish and die; for instance, the haleyons, which I found sustaining life and breeding on the parched plains of the interior during the severe droughts of 1838-9, far removed from any water. The food of these birds is insects and lizards."*

When we bear in mind that Australia measures, in round numbers, about 3000 miles in length, that is, from east to west, and that, taking in Van-Dieman's Land, its breadth from north to south is nearly of the

same extent, it may easily be supposed, in spite of vast tracts of uniform country, to present a considerable variety of physical structure and of climate, and a corresponding variety in the natural products of its different and distant parts. Van-Dieman's Land, from its smaller size and more southern position, is cooler and more humid than its mightier neighbour. The vegetation is abundant, the forests dense and difficult of access. New Holland, from its 25th to its 35th parallel, is much drier, and has a temperature which Mr. Gould supposes to be higher than that of any other portion of the world—the thermometer not unfrequently rising to 110°, 120°, and even 130° in the shade. Hot winds sweep over the country from the northward, indicating the dry and parched character of the interior, and the falls of rain being uncertain and irregular, droughts of several months' continuance occur, during which the rivers, lakes, lagoons, are all dried up, and the earth becomes as a desolate wilderness.

"Pure element of waters! wheresoe'er

Thou dost forsake thy subterranean haunts,
Green herbs, bright flowers, and berry-bearing plants,

Rise into life, and in thy train appear:

And through the sunny portion of the year,
Swift insects shine, thy hovering pursuivants:
But if thy bounty fail, the forest pants,
And hart, and hind, and hunter with his spear,
Languish and droop together."

In New Holland such of the native creatures as possess extensive powers of locomotion, either remove to the mountains, where vegetation is less burnt up, or betake themselves to far off districts, while thousands of the less active or domesticated beings perish.

"At length," says Mr. Gould, "a change takes place, and rain falls abundantly, and the plains, on which but lately not a blade of herbage was to be seen, and over which the stillness of desolation reigned, become green with luxuriant vegetation. *Orchidæ*, and thousands of flowers of the loveliest hues, are profusely spread around, as if nature rejoiced in her renovation, and the grain springing up vigorously gives promise of an abundant harvest. This change from sterility to abundance in the vegetable world is accompanied by a correspondent increase of animal life—the waters become stocked with fish, the marshy districts with frogs and other reptiles, hosts of caterpillars and other insects make their appearance, and, spreading over the surface of the country, commence the work of devastation, which is, however, speedily checked by the birds of various kinds that follow in their train. Attracted by the abundance of food, hawks of three or four species, in flocks of hundreds, depart from their usual solitary habits, become gregarious and busy at the feast, and thousands of straw-necked Ibises, (*Ibis spinicollis*,) and other species

* Introduction, p. 15.

of the feathered race, revel in the profusion of a welcome banquet."

As usual there is in New Holland a very direct relationship between the nature and extent of the general vegetation on the one hand, and the character and number of the feathered tribes on the other. It is, of course, chiefly in the vicinity of the few rivers which intersect the known parts of the country, and in the lower flats which receive the floods, that we find a more luxurious vegetation, and trees of gigantic growth. The stately *Eucalypti*, in particular, attain to a most enormous size. Mr. Backhouse measured one on the Lopham road, near Emeu Bay, in Van-Dieman's Land, which, though rather hollow at the bottom and broken at the top, was 49 feet in circumference at nearly two yards from the ground. Another that was solid, and supposed to be 200 feet high, was 41 feet round. A third, calculated to be 250 feet in height, was $55\frac{1}{2}$ round. As it spread much at the surface of the ground, it was there nearly 70 feet in circumference. A prostrate tree found near the junction of the Emeu River with the Loud water, was 35 feet in circumference at the base, 22 at a height of 66, and 19 at 110. It threw out a couple of large branches at the height of 120 feet, and its general head began to branch off at 150 feet. Its total length, as traced upon the ground, was 213 feet. A party of four abreast walked with ease along its trunk. In its fall it had upset an aspiring young neighbour, whose height had been 168 feet.

Great deltas are formed in New Holland, as elsewhere, by the descent of the interior rivers near their junction with the sea. Such is the Great Scrub, near the mouth of the Murray, an enormous flat of 100 miles in length, by above 20 in breadth, and clothed with a peculiar vegetation, dwarf *Eucalypti* forming a central belt, margined by shrub-like trees of various kinds. Immense belts of *Banksia* clothe the sand-hills of the sea-coast, and of some parts of the interior. Other districts are covered with grass-trees, (*Xanthorrhoea*), while the intertropical regions, so far as known of those almost *Terræ incognitæ*, produce, besides the *Eucalypti*, *Banksia*, and others of the southern coast, thick forests of canes, mangroves, &c. Now all these peculiar forest regions present an ornithology in a great measure peculiar to each. The *Banksia* are everywhere frequented by the true meliphagous or honey-sucking birds; the *Eucalypti* by the *Trichoglossi* and *Ptiloti*; the lofty fig-trees (so called) by the beautiful regent and satin birds; the palms by the *Carcophagæ*, or fruit-eating pigeons, and the verdurous plains by

the ground pigeons and grass parrakeets. Perhaps the most remarkable fact of a negative nature connected with the distribution of New Holland birds, is the entire absence of the woodpecker tribe, a race which occurs in all parts of the world except Australia and the Polynesian Islands. Mr. Gould attributes this absence of the genus *Picus* to the fact, that the New Holland trees are destitute of a thick or corrugated bark. It is interesting to study the relationships and dependencies which may thus be so often traced among existing things, especially in those between which we do not at first perceive the likelihood of any natural connexion.

On analyzing Mr. Gould's great work on the Birds of Australia, containing, as we have said, 636 distinct species, it will be found, when we re-arrange them in relation to their occurrence in certain great districts of the country, that 385 species inhabit New South Wales, 289 South Australia, 243 Western Australia, 230 Northern Australia, and 181 Van-Dieman's Land. Of these 88 are peculiar to New South Wales, 16 to South Australia, 36 to Western Australia, 105 to Northern Australia, and 32 to Van-Dieman's Land.

"The great excess," he observes, "in the number of species inhabiting New South Wales, is doubtless attributable to the singular belt of luxuriant vegetation, termed brushes, which stretches along the southern and south-eastern coasts, between the ranges and the sea, and which is tenanted by a fauna peculiarly its own. Although this part of the continent is inhabited by a larger number of species than any other, it is a remarkable fact, that the species peculiar to Northern Australia are much more numerous than those peculiar to New South Wales. It is curious to observe also, that while Southern Australia is inhabited by a much larger number of species than Western Australia, those peculiar to the former are not half so numerous as those peculiar to the latter. The more southern position, and consequently colder climate of Van-Dieman's Land, will readily account for the paucity of species found in that island."—*Introduction*, p. 134.

By the term *peculiar*, Mr. Gould does not desire to convey the notion that the species referred to are strictly or exclusively confined to the respective districts named, but merely that as yet they have not hitherto been discovered elsewhere.

We shall now notice a few of the more special features of Australian Ornithology. It will be remembered that so early in the history of New Holland as the days of Cook and Flinders, nests were observed of extraordinary magnitude. They were built upon the ground, rose to a height of two feet, were of great circumference, and very capacious

in the centre. They were composed of branches and twigs of trees, and other materials, sufficient to fill a cart. Cook found one upon Eagle Island, on the east coast. Flinders fell in with another which contained residual masses resembling, though on a larger scale, the pellets of fur, and bones of mice, &c., disgorged by owls in England. They consisted in this case of the hair of seals and land animals, of the scaly feathers of the penguins, and the bones of other birds, and of small quadrupeds.

"Possibly," says Flinders, "the constructor of the nest might be an enormous owl, and if so, the cause of the bird being never seen, whilst the nests were not scarce, would be from its not going out until dark; but from the very open and exposed situations in which the nests were found, I should rather judge it to be of the eagle kind, and that its powers are such as to render it heedless of any attempts of the natives upon its young."*

The Navigator was, in all probability, right regarding the group to which the bird belonged, although he took rather too much of a Sinbad-the-Sailor view of its supposed prowess or powers of resistance. It is now believed that these nests belong to the beautiful white-bellied sea-eagle, (*Haliastur leucogaster*), by no means a ponderous species, nor requiring for itself and young so large a dwelling; but as these and several allied species continue to resort to the same eyry for a long succession of seasons, and carry fresh materials for re-construction and addition every year, it is easy to account for the eventual mass. Mr. Gould informs us that he found similar nests on rocks and promontories on Islands in Bass's Straits, and took from them the young of *Hal. leucogaster*.

Only one species of buzzard has been discovered in New Holland—*Buteo melanosternon*. A curious anecdote regarding it was transmitted to Mr. Gould by his assistant, Mr. Gilbert. The bird is so bold, that when it discovers an emeu, an almost gigantic creature of the ostrich tribe, seated on her nest, it will attack her with such alarming ferocity as to drive her off. The hawk then takes up a stone between its talons, hovers with it in the air, lets it fall upon the eggs, to break their shell, and then descends to feed on their contents at leisure. Along our own shores we may every day observe the carrion and grey crows flying suddenly upwards high in air, each with a mussel in its bill, which it drops from its airy height upon a stone or rocky ledge below, so as to smash the shell and render its contents available.

Knowing the latter fact to be true, we see no reason to doubt the former. In the one case the stone is made to fall upon the food, in the other the food is dropt upon the stone. In both the knowledge of cause and effect is much the same. Does this knowledge proceed from reason or instinct?

Several swifts and swallows are found in New Holland, all distinguished, as in Europe, by their almost never ceasing flight. A species with a peculiarly constructed tail (*Acanthylis caudacuta*) belongs to a group possessed of extraordinary powers of wing. It is a migratory bird in Australia, but from whence it comes and whither it goeth no man knows. A specimen was killed in England not many years ago, but why and by route it came may be more easy to surmise than ascertain.

Among the *Halcyonidæ*, or king-fisher family, (including the king-hunters of the forest and more central districts,) the genus *Dacelo* comprises the largest species, and forms one of the most peculiar and conspicuous features of Australian ornithology. They are confined, however, to the south-eastern and northern provinces, the south-western possessing no species of the genus. Dr. Leichardt, in his "Journal," states, that when near the Gulph of Carpentaria, the "laughing jackass," as these birds are called, was of a different species (*Dacelo cervina*) from that of the eastern coast, being smaller in size, and "speaking a different language." Mr. Gould believes that these birds seldom or never drink, so their laughter cannot be supposed to proceed from any undue excitement. The allied genus *Halcyon* has many habits in common with the *Dacelo*. The species "dwell, among other places, in the open plains, far away from water, and consequently must live for considerable periods without a supply of that element." The genus *Alcyon*, though found in New Guinea and the Indian islands, is more abundant in Australia than in any other country. The species differ from the preceding in frequenting the margins of rivers, where they prey on insects and small fish, and have much in common with the beautiful king-fisher of Europe, the type of the now restricted genus *Alcedo*.

Among the most extraordinary of the Australian birds, so far as concerns certain peculiar habits, are the *bower-birds*, so called from their constructing little galleries or covered ways for their own amusement and recreation, in no way connected with their nests. Those of the spotted bower-bird (*Chlamydera maculata*) are almost three feet long, constructed outwardly of twigs, and beautifully lined with tall grasses, so dis-

* *Voyage*, vol. i. pp. 64-81.

posed that their points converge above. The most singular thing is, that these little arbours are profusely, if not richly, *decorated* in various ways, being strewed over with shells, the skulls of small quadrupeds, bones, and miscellaneous articles.

"I have frequently," observes our author, "found these structures at a considerable distance from the rivers, from the borders of which they could alone have procured these shells and small round pebbly stones; their collection and transportation must, therefore, have been a task of great labour and difficulty. As these birds feed almost entirely on seeds and fruits, the shells and bones cannot have been collected for any other purpose than ornament."*

The actual nest of this bird is very similar to that of the common thrush of Europe. It was found among the smaller branches of an acacia, overhanging a pool of water.

"I found matter of conjecture," says Captain Stokes, in relation to an allied species, "in noticing a number of twigs with their ends stuck in the ground, (which was strewed over with shells,) and their tops brought together so as to form a small bower; this was two and a half feet long, one and a half foot wide at either end. It was not until my next visit to Port Essington that I thought this anything but some Australian mother's toy to amuse her child; there I was asked one day to go and see the 'bird's play-house,' when I immediately recognised the same kind of construction I had seen at the Victoria River; the bird (*Chlamydera nuchalis* of Mr. Gould) was amusing itself by flying backwards and forwards, taking a shell alternately from each side, and carrying it through the archway in its mouth."†

This building of a bower-like structure for a play-ground, or even, as it seems, assembly-hall, is practised by another cunning artificer of great beauty, called the satin bower-bird,—*Ptilonorhynchus holosericeus*. Its chamber is usually placed beneath the shade of some overhanging tree in the most retired recesses of the forest.

"The base consists of an extensive and rather convex platform of sticks firmly interwoven, in the centre of which the bower itself is built; this, like the platform on which it is placed, and with which it is interwoven, is formed of sticks and twigs, but of more slender and flexible description, the tips of the wings being so arranged as to curve upwards and nearly meet at the top; in the interior of the bower the materials are so placed that the forks of the twigs are always presented outwards, by which arrangement not the slightest obstruction is offered to the passage of the bird. The interest

of this curious bower is much enhanced by the manner in which it is decorated at and near the entrance with the most gaily coloured articles that can be collected, such as the blue tail-feathers of the rose-bill and Pennantian parrots, bleached bones, the shells of snails, &c. For what purpose these curious bowers are made is not yet perhaps fully understood; they are certainly not used as a nest, but as a place of resort for many individuals of both sexes, which, there assembled, run through and around the bower in a sportive manner, and that so frequently that it is seldom entirely deserted."—*Birds of Australia*, vol. iv. Plate 10.

Mr. Strange of Sydney, who kept a pair in his aviary, (they unfortunately died on the passage round Cape Horn, on their way to the late Earl of Derby,) where they neither bred nor built a nest, observed that they occupied themselves constantly for two months constructing bowers. The male is the principal workman; and our informant adds, "they are built for the express purpose of courting the female in."

The *Psittacideæ*, or parrot tribe, form a remarkable feature in the ornithology of New Holland. It was an odd notion of Buffon that no parrot occurred either northwards or southwards beyond the 25th degree on either side of the equator. He seems to have despised, as Pennant pointed out, the authority of the Dutch navigator Spilbergen, who found the woods full of them in the neighbourhood of Terra del Fuego, south latitude 54°. He might have called to mind the evidence of Commodore Byron, who says he saw them in countless flocks in the woods of Port Famine Harbour. They were observed by Captain Cook in New Zealand, by Captain Furneaux in Van-Dieman's Land. In our own days we find a North American species spreading far beyond the river Illinois, to the vicinity of Lake Michigan, north latitude 42°. Parrots were seen by Alexander Wilson on the banks of the Ohio, in the month of February, flying through a snow storm in full rejoicing cry.

"No one group of birds," says Mr. Gould, "gives to Australia so tropical and foreign an air as the numerous species of this great family by which it is tenanted, each and all of which are individually very abundant. Immense flocks of white cockatoos are sometimes seen perched among the green foliage of the *Eucalypti*; the brilliant scarlet breasts of the kind called Rose-hills, blaze forth from the yellow flowering *Acacia*; the *Trichoglossi* or honey-eating parakeets, enliven the flowering branches of the *Eucalypti* with their beauty and their lively actions; the little grass parakeets rise from the plains of the interior, and render these solitary spots a world of animation; nay, the very towns, particularly Hobart Town and Adelaide, are

**Birds of Australia*, vol. iv. Plate 8.

†*Discoveries in Australia*, vol. ii. p. 97.

constantly visited by flights of this beautiful tribe of birds, which traverse the streets with arrow-like swiftness, and chase each other precisely after the manner the swifts are seen to do in our own islands. In the public roads of Van-Dieman's Land the beautiful *Platyercus* may be constantly seen in small companies, performing precisely the same office as the sparrows in England. I have also seen flocks of from fifty to a hundred, like tame pigeons at the barn-doors in the farm-yards of the settlers, to which they descend for the refuse grain thrown out with the straws by the thrashers. As might naturally be expected, the agriculturist is often sadly annoyed by the destruction certain species effect among his newly-sown and ripening corn, particularly where the land has been recently cleared and is adjacent to the brushes."*

Fifty-five species of this great and sumptuous family are figured and described in Mr. Gould's larger work. These seem to constitute four principal groups, each comprising several genera, nearly the whole of which are strictly and peculiarly Australian. For example, neither *Calyptorhynchus*, *Platyercus*, *Euphema*, *Psephotus*, *Melopsittacus*, or *Nymphacus*, has been found in any other region; and they are certainly elsewhere unsurpassed either in elegance of form or splendour of plumage.

Of the genus *Nestor* only two species are known,—one, *N. Hypopolius*, confined to New Zealand,—the other, *N. Productus*, an Australian kind. Both are somewhat peculiar looking parrots, with the point of the upper mandible greatly prolonged. They are supposed to be the remnants of a tribe, all other members of which have perished, and of the two which remain it may be said that they are on the verge of extinction. The New Holland species has indeed a most singularly restricted range. It is known nowhere in the wide world, except on Philip Island, the circumference of which is not more than five miles, scarcely larger than the lone St. Kilda.

"So strictly, in fact," says Mr. Gould, "is it confined to this isolated spot, that many persons who have resided in Norfolk Island for years, have assured me its occurrence there is never known, although the distance from one island to the other is not more than three or four miles. I regret to state, that in consequence of the settlement of Norfolk Island, the native haunts of this fine bird have been so intruded upon, and such a war of extermination been carried on against it, that, if such be not the case already, the time is not far distant when the species will be completely extirpated, and, like the dodo, its skin and bones become the only mementoes of its existence."

Mr. Gould has since informed us person-

ally that this remarkable bird is now actually extinct as a wild species. A few which exist in confinement, as objects of curiosity, are all that survive, and as they do not breed in captivity, so soon as these cease to exist, the whole species will have perished. Little is known of their natural habits, but the shape and structure of the tongue are very peculiar, and a tame one seen at Sydney, instead of waddling in the awkward way peculiar to most parrots, leaped lightly like a crow. What a strange contrast is presented by the restricted distribution of this species, actually now confined to a few cages in Sydney, or elsewhere, and that of the turnstone, formerly referred to, which wings its unimpeded way in every region of the earth.

The *Columbidæ* or pigeon tribe, are distributed over all the world, and exist in great force in Australia. We there find no less than 21 distinct species, many of them remarkable for brilliancy of color, and a peculiar metallic lustre, which finely illustrates the beautiful expressions of Holy Scripture,—“as the wings of a dove covered with silver, and her feathers with yellow gold.” The species of the genus *Phaps* are probably confined to Australia, but are more widely distributed over that vast region than any other section of the family, being found throughout the entire country, wherever the foot of man has wandered and his eye observed. The most arid deserts of the interior are visited by them, if the smallest supply of water be within reach of their evening flight, “which is performed with the most extraordinary rapidity and power.” Capt. Stuart informs us, in relation to *Phaps histrionica*, that it collects in large flocks in March and April, living on the seed of the rice-grass, which the natives also collect for food, and that during the short period of that harvest, the flavour of its flesh is delicious. It flies to water at sunset, but only wets its bill; and it has often excited the wonder of the way-worn traveller, that so small a supply should suffice to quench its thirst amid those burning plains.

“The numbers of this genus,” adds Mr. Gould, “generally known by the name of bronze-wings, not only form an excellent viand for the settlers, but one of the greatest boons bestowed upon the explorer, since they not only furnish him with a supply of nutritious food, but direct him by their straight and arrow-like evening flight to the situations where he may find water, that element without which man cannot exist.”—P. 79.


One of the most remarkable facts in the history of the pigeon tribe in general, is the

* Introduction, p. 70.

extraordinary flocks in which certain species are sometimes found. Alexander Wilson calculated a flight of passenger pigeons (*Ectopistes Migratoria*) which continued to pass over him for the greater portion of a day, to have been a mile in breadth, and 240 miles in length, and to have contained (three birds being assigned to every square yard) at least *two thousand two hundred and thirty million, two hundred and seventy-two thousand pigeons!* What a vast number of pies they would have made, and in those what consumption of flour and butter. The lamented Audubon, in his delightful *Ornithological Biography*, (vol. i. p. 319,) confirms the narration of his predecessor by a still more extraordinary statement; and he adds, that as every pigeon consumes fully half a pint of food, (chiefly mast,) the supply which *his* flock would have required must have amounted to *eight million seven hundred and twelve thousand bushels* per day. How hopeless to be a protectionist farmer in America!

The family called *Megapodidae* form a group more or less distributed over Australia, New Guinea, the Celebes, and the Philippine Islands. Their history and habits are truly singular, and differ in several respects from those of all others of the feathered race. The three species which belong to New Holland are referable to three distinct genera, *Tallegalla*, (containing the bird erroneously named New Holland vulture, by the older authors,) *Leipoa*, and *Megapodius*. In their structure Mr. Gould regards them as most nearly allied to the *Gallinaceæ*, although in some of their actions and their mode of flight, they greatly resemble the *Rallidae*, and it is his opinion that the small size of their brain, coupled with the extraordinary means employed for the incubation of their eggs, "indicates an extremely low degree of organization." They have much in common with each other, and agree in the anomalous nature of their nidification. They all deposit their eggs in vast mounds of earth and leaves, constructed by themselves, and which become heated, either by fermentation of the vegetable materials, or the sun's rays, so as to constitute a natural hot-bed, or forcing apparatus, in which the eggs are hatched, and from which the young eventually emerge in full feather, and capable of maintaining themselves (which many other bipeds do not do) by their own exertions from the first. An excellent account of the nest of one of these species, *Leipoa ocellata*, has been given by Sir George Grey—not the late Secretary for the Home Department—but the Governor of New Zealand,

formerly of South Australia. We may mention that the bird referred to roosts at night on trees, runs with extraordinary rapidity, never flies when it can help it, and weighs (the male bird) about four pounds and a half.

"The mounds they construct," says Sir George, "are from twelve to thirteen yards in circumference at the base, and from two to three feet in height, the general form being that of a dome. The sand and grass are sometimes scraped up for a distance of from fifteen to sixteen feet from its outer edge. The mound appears to be constructed as follows:—A nearly circular hole, of about eighteen inches in diameter, is scratched in the ground, to the depth of seven or eight inches, and filled with dead leaves, and grass, and similar materials, and a large mass of the same substance is placed all round it on the ground. Over this first layer, a large mound of sand, mixed with dry grass, &c., is thrown, and, finally, the whole assumes the form of a dome, as I have stated. When an egg is to be deposited the top is laid open, and a hole is scraped in its centre, to within two or three inches of the bottom of the layer of dried leaves. The egg is placed in the sand, just at the edge of the hole, in a vertical position, with the smaller end downwards. The sand is then thrown in again, and the mound left in its original form. The egg which has thus been deposited is therefore completely surrounded and enveloped in soft sand, having from four to six inches of sand between the lower end of the egg and the layer of dried leaves. When a second egg is laid, it is deposited in precisely the same plane as the first, but at the opposite side of the hole before alluded to. When a third egg is laid it is placed in the same plane as the others, but as it were at the third corner of a square. When the fourth egg is laid it is still placed in the same plane; but in the fourth corner of the square, or rather of the lozenge, the figure being of this form—; the next four

eggs in succession are placed in the interstices, but always in the same plane, so that at last there is a circle of eight eggs, all standing upright in the sand, with several inches of sand intervening between each."

These singular mounds are usually found in sandy, scrubby districts, but placed in some little open glade in the thickest part of the scrub. The eggs are of a pale pink colour, and so thin and fragile, that unless handled with the greatest care they break. All attempts to hatch them under domestic poultry have failed, by reason of brittleness.

Mr. Gilbert also describes these mound-shaped nests. The largest he saw was only in a state of preparation. It measured forty-five feet in circumference, and if moulded in proportion at the top, would have been fully five feet high. He adds that he found the white ants very numerous in these mounds, making their covered galleries

all around, and even attached to the eggs themselves, thus disinterestedly preparing a sufficiency of food for the young bird, as soon as it emerges from the shell. Mr. Drummond, who was experienced in horticultural hot-beds, was of opinion that the central heat of these mounds was equal to 80°.

The allied species of the genus *Megapodius*, construct their nests upon a similar principle, and of still more gigantic size. Mr. John Macgillivray, the observing son of an observant father, during the survey of Endeavor Straits, found three of their mounds in the small island of Nogo. The one which seemed most recent was placed on the crest of a hill, and measured eight feet in height, (thirteen and a half along the slope,) and seventy-seven feet in circumference. It was composed of well packed earth, stones, decaying leaves and branches, and other vegetable matter, with some living roots. After several hours' hard digging, fragments of eggs and a dead chick were found at a depth of six feet from the nearest surface. Another mound at the foot of the hill, and close upon the beach, measured not less than 150 feet in circumference; and to form this immense mass of materials the birds had scraped the ground in the vicinity quite bare, and numerous shallow excavations showed where they had been to quarry. It was of an irregular oval shape, the summit not being in the centre, but nearer the broader end, and fourteen feet high. Though inhabited by only a single pair of birds at a time, these nests are probably the work of several generations, being repaired and added to from season to season. To many people it seems as if there was much to do about nothing, but doubtless the birds know best.

We shall here take no note of those numerous, swift-running, and deep-wading tribes, which constitute the great order *Grallatores*.* Let us pass to a brief observance of the web-footed, or swimming birds, strictly so called, (although many of the waders also swim like corks,) the order *Natatores*.

A comparative view of the various groups of the last named order, as inhabitants of Europe in the one hemisphere, and of New Holland in the other, exhibits some remarkable features. In each region there is both excess and deficiency of certain kinds, and we think that one important and valuable attribute of such correct and completed works as Mr. Gould's, viz., the "Birds of Europe," and the "Birds of New Holland," consists in their enabling us to institute such

comparative views. No doubt we are much more perfectly acquainted with the former than with the latter, but still, we now in all probability possess sufficient samples, so to speak, of all the most important genera, even of the latter country, to enable us to stand on solid ground. The numerical results of this comparison, so far as concerns swimming birds, are as follows:—Of the true *Anatidæ*, or ducks, not counting mergansers, Europe possesses at least forty species, while only eighteen are known in Australia. Of the *Laridæ*, or gulls, twenty species dwell in Europe, while only three occur in Australia.* On the other hand, while Europe has only twelve species of terns, or sea-swallows, sixteen frequent the far Australian shores. Of the *Procellariidæ*, or petrels, very oceanic species, nearly forty are found on the Australian seas, while not more than seven are known to occur in those of Europe. Of the puffins and guillemots again, which so abound along many parts of our native and other northern shores, not a single species has ever been found in Australia, or indeed in any portion of the Southern ocean. On the other hand, penguins there abound, but are quite unknown in Europe. Grebes and cormorants are about equipoised in the two hemispheres.

The black swan, (*Cygnus atratus*), so long regarded as a "*rara avis in terris*," but now so frequent and well known, is a native of Australia, where it seems restricted to the southern districts. At least, it has never been observed in Torres Straits, or on any of the northern coasts. It is the only true swan found to the south of the Equator, the majority of the others occurring in the most northern parts of Europe and America.

A species of sooty tern occurs in vast abundance on Raine's Islet in May and June, as observed by a party employed to build the beacon there. About 1500 dozen of eggs were procured during the latter month, and great numbers of young birds were obtained for the pot. A mess of 22 men consumed on an average 50 every day, and supposing the convicts, about 20 in number, to have eaten as many, 3000 birds must have been devoured in the "leafy month of June," yet so vast was the congregated body, that no sensible diminution in their number was perceptible. It is a grand sight to see an albatross (*Diomedea exulans*) either poised, as it were, almost motionless, high in air, itself more radiant than a summer cloud, or sweeping past upon unwearied wings, as if rejoicing when ruthless winds and waves "lift up their

* We have already, in our introductory observations, referred to the vast geographical expanse over which some of the species are dispersed.

* One of them is a skua gull, and is named *Lestris catarractes* by Mr. Gould, as if it were identical with a European species, but this we believe is doubtful

voices," and "ancient mariners" grow pale with fear. When full grown, this great seabird weighs from 17 to 20 pounds, and its "sail-broad vans" measure nearly twelve feet from tip to tip. It occurs along Van Dieman's Land, and many of the Australian shores, except the northern parts. Unless during the breeding season, these birds, and the petrels, are found habitually spread over the wilderness of waters, entirely regardless of their distance, though it may be some thousand miles from land. Their powers of flight are excessive, their feet well webbed, and their bodies extremely buoyant. A racer is a vain thing for safety, compared with their swift and sure careering over sea and shore. Of the albatross there are nine known species, of which three frequent the North Pacific Ocean, and six the waters south of the Equator.

In the genus *Puffinus*, (bearing little or no relation to the *Puffins* of our northern seas,) are included certain kinds of petrels, of which one, *P. brevicaudatus*, is remarkable for the vast congregations in which it is sometimes seen. It is the kind referred to in the following extract from Flinder's Voyage:—

"There was a stream of from 50 to 80 yards in depth, and of 300 yards or more in breadth, the birds were not scattered, but were flying as compactly as a free movement of their wings seemed to allow; and during a full hour and a half, this stream of petrels continued to pass without interruption, at a rate little inferior to the swiftness of the pigeon. On the lowest computation, I think the number could not have been less than a hundred millions. Taking the stream to have been 50 yards deep, by 300 in width, and that it moved at the rate of 30 miles an hour, and allowing nine cubic yards of span to each bird, the number would amount to 151,500,000. The burrows required to lodge this quantity of birds would be 75,750,000; and allowing a square yard to each burrow, they would cover something more than 18½ geographical square miles."*

The tropic bird, so interesting to all who voyage across the equatorial seas, and the silvery lustre of whose plumage renders it, though almost colourless, one of the most beautiful of the feathered race, is represented in Australia by the more southern form of *Phæton phœnicurus*, distinguished by the red colour of the central line of the elongated tail feathers. It breeds in Norfolk Island, and elsewhere.

The *Pelicans* are widely dispersed over the watery world, every great region of the earth, not altogether northern, having one or

more species. The Australian kind, *Pel. conspicillatus*, is a large and sumptuous looking creature. Of the cormorants, a nearly allied tribe, though of a darker and more sinister aspect, we find no less than five different species in the country now under consideration. When Milton placed the first Tempter in Paradise, in likeness of a cormorant perched on a tree, he was criticised, though falsely, for having raised a web-footed bird to such arboreal height. But the immortal poet was correct, as cormorants of certain kinds, and he was free to choose, are often seen on trees. The greatest of our modern minstrels, in his autobiography, while describing a renowned seat of learning, not as it was, but as he deemed it might have been, presents us with many solemn and tranquillizing images and trains of thought:—

"This truth escaped me not, and I confess,
That having 'mid my native hills given loose
To a school-boy's vision, I had raised a pile
Upon the basis of the coming time,
That fell in ruins round me. Oh, what joy
To see a sanctuary for our country's youth
Informed with such a spirit as might be
Its own protection; a primeval grove,
Where, though the shades with cheerfulness
were filled,
Nor indigent of songs warbled from crowds
In under-coverts, yet the countenance
Of the whole place should bear a stamp of awe;
A habitation sober and demure
For ruminating creatures; a domain
For quiet things to wander in; a haunt
In which the heron should delight to feed
By the shy rivers, and the pelican
Upon the cypress spire, in lonely thought
Might sit and sun himself.—Alas! alas!
In vain for such solemnity I looked."*

The picture is striking and suggestive. How beautiful the contrast between the rich creamy white of the pelican's immaculate garment, and the dark funereal hue of the melancholy cypress!

"Like fir-tree bough
To which on some unruffled morning clings,
A flaky weight of winter's purest snow."

We believe the renowned Laker, like his great predecessor, is ornithologically right in his selection of the pelican as, being, though a web-footed, yet a perching bird, as it does occasionally roost on trees; but as it never ventures so far west as Britain, it can scarcely be regarded as an appropriate emblem of intellectual tranquillity and repose on the banks of the Cam. The ornithologist, at least, can find it in neither field nor forest in any part of Western Europe:—

* Voyage, vol. i. p. 170.

* Wordsworth's *Prelude*, p. 73.

"Alas! Alas!"

In vain for such solemnity he looks."

We shall conclude our fragmentary sketch of the Australian birds with the penguins, (*Spheniscideæ*), a most peculiar group, characteristic of the southern seas. Van-Dieman's Land and the islands in Bass's Straits are their principal resorts during the breeding season. Tons of dead birds of the penguin kind are elsewhere dug up by our seamen from a considerable depth while collecting guano, from which it is inferred that they are the principal producers of that novel and now valuable agricultural ingredient, and that it has a preservative effect on animal substances, from the recognizable condition in which, after a long entombment, the birds are found. A Portuguese sailor was extracted lately, looking remarkably well. He is supposed to have lain for a greater number of years imbedded in the guano, than he had previously spent upon the surface of the earth.

We shall now turn our steps homewards, to take into consideration a few of the ornithological relationships which exist between our own country and the sister isle. Although above sixty more species of birds have been found in Great Britain than in Ireland, the majority of the excess is occasioned by continental stragglers, which are either blown out of their intended way, or take the nearer island temporarily in the course of their natural migratory movements. Although many species, as we have already seen, are widely spread, yet there is such a thing as a system of geographical distribution, or rather restriction, most species having what may be called a central region where they most abound, and beyond which they become scarce, and finally disappear. The western shores of continental Europe form almost the extreme boundary of many species, that is, they have become scarce even in districts not upon the actual coast. In regard to these their occurrence in Britain is uninfrequent, if not accidental; they are found, if at all, along our eastern shores, and are either still more rare in Ireland, or totally unknown. It is therefore the remoteness of our islands from the geographical centre of several European species to which we owe their absence, rather than to anything in the physical structure or climatic character of these islands. It is thus that the ptarmigan, (*Tetrao lagopus*), a species abundant in Scandinavia and the central Alps of Europe, has certain outlying flocks in Scotland and the Hebrides, but is unknown in Ireland. Its occurrence in the island of Jura, which though mountainous is

not Alpine, and in Islay, which is scarcely even mountainous, shews that its absence from Ireland is not owing to want of elevation, for the "Green Isle" has loftier ranges than those of Jura, and possesses also those granitic and schistose summits on which the ptarmigan delights to dwell. The black-cock, (*Tetrao tetrix*), which abounds over a great portion of central Europe, becomes less frequent as we travel westward, and has never got further in that direction than Britain, and a few of its nearer islands, where, however, several circumstances (at least in Scotland) seem in later years to have favoured its preservation and increase.

So also in regard to birds of passage, or summer migrants. These are influenced in their movements by an instinct which takes them in spring from south to north, in autumn from north to south. The great mass are bred in temperate or northern countries, which are warm in summer, but from a peculiarity of constitution, certain species cannot stand the cold which, during winter, falls upon the regions of their birth, and so they migrate southwards to avoid it. There is, however, no essential or specific difference, in many cases, between permanent and migratory birds, many *individuals* among the latter being stationary, that is, never travel northwards at all. Indeed, not a few species are known to be permanent in one country, and birds of passage in another. Their migratory habits, therefore, depend, in some measure, on the places of their birth, and the necessity under which they may be placed of withdrawing from the winter's cold. Thus several birds are migratory in Scandinavia and the arctic regions of America, which are not so in Britain, owing to the comparative mildness of our "sea-girt isle."

It is a distinctly ascertained fact, that many European birds winter in the north of Africa. Voyagers from the Straits of Gibraltar to Italy, Greece, and Turkey, have had frequent and prolonged opportunities of observing these migrations both in spring and autumn, and the great flights of quails, and their few days sojourn on certain islands of the Mediterranean *en route* northwards, are well known. Now, as this migratory impulse is from north to south, or *vice versa*, and not from east to west, or the contrary—that is, as the latitude is always greatly changed, but seldom or much less the longitude, it is easy to perceive that the principal stream of migratory species flowing northwards in spring from the southern shores of the Mediterranean, will not strike upon Britain, which lies too far to the westward. If a falcon were to leave Algiers

and wing its way northwards, it would miss our South Foreland, and have but little chance of picking up a Norfolk pout. But such migratory species, or individuals of those species, as travel by Spain and over the western provinces of France, naturally arrive on the British Islands,—a greater number of them in Britain than in Ireland, and a larger proportion in the south-eastern counties of England than elsewhere. It is thus that the nightingale, and some other summer songsters, so frequent in the eastern counties of the south of England, are rare in Devonshire, never heard in Wales, and quite unknown in Ireland. Thus the preponderance of British over Irish species is no doubt owing to Great Britain, and especially the southern portion of England, having a more eastern position. The same cause assigns to Sweden several remarkable southern or summer migrants, such as the hoopoe, (*Upupa epops*), quite unknown to Britain, except as casual visitants, few and far between. We may add, that while England has several southern species which do not cross our borders, Scotland has several northern ones, (among the ducks and divers,) which, though only winter birds in England, never leave us, but abide and breed among our northern lakes and marshes throughout the summer.

It must be evident to all who are interested in the geographical distribution of species, that an accurate knowledge of the ornithology of Ireland is of great importance. It is the "Ultima Thule" of Europe on the west, and the first piece of terra firma on which any American species, some of which occasionally cross the Atlantic, can set its foot. The mildness of its climate has some influence on its birds. Certain land species, which, as British birds, are found during winter in only the extreme south of England, occur familiarly in the north of Ireland all the year round. The moisture as well as mildness of the climate, and the extent of bog, which is admitted to be rather considerable in Ireland, causes the assemblage in winter of several species of Gallatorial and other birds in much greater numbers than in Britain. Were Ireland joined to Britain it would probably gain a few additions of such species as frequent our western districts, and have gone no further. But it would not gain the nightingale, which, in the existing state of things, does not visit Wales or the western coasts of England. Neither would it gain that species of stock-dove called *Columba oenas*, a resident forest species, which does not range further westward than the midland counties of England, and is still un-

known in any part of Scotland. Ireland has no resident bird belonging to itself, or different from those of Britain; and Britain and Ireland conjoined have only one species peculiar to themselves—the red-grouse, or moor-fowl, (*Tetrao Scoticus*), which is known nowhere else throughout the world, and affords one of the most singular examples of restricted distribution with which naturalists are acquainted.*

With the exception just named, Great Britain and Ireland, then, may be said to belong ornithologically to the continent of Europe. If another island existed beyond Ireland, which fortunately, for many reasons, is not the case, the species there would be still fewer, because the further we remove from one centre of distribution without entering into another, the numbers decrease, and this decrease is accelerated by *insulation*. But if a great western world like America was close at hand, which also fortunately, for an equal number of reasons, is not the case, both Ireland and the imaginary island beyond it would become more affluent in their ornithology, because in the event supposed, while they would still be near the circumference of their own great eastern circle of distribution, they would have also entered within the range of a western one, and thus gain an accession of species. When we talk of centres and circles of distribution, it must be understood that these terms are not intended to signify that each circle or range is distinct in itself, and different from its neighbours, far and near. On the contrary, there is, though a continual yet a gradual change of species, a new one ever and anon appearing as an old one disappears, so that each great country, if not altogether apart or extremely remote from any neighbour, contains much in common with some other country on either side, as well as something peculiar to and characteristic of itself. The circle of each great group is variously intersected by portions of circles of other contiguous groups. A zoological centre and circle may in fact be likened, in some measure, to those which a traveller on the face of the earth forms and sees around him. As he advances on his way, the component parts of the scene are changing step by step, but still he continues ever the centre of his own fair sphere, surrounded by a circle varying by such slow and slight gradations, that he scarcely apprehends the change, except by a recalling and comparison of distant parts. Every

* It is usually regarded as the *most singular*; but the existence of a peculiar parrot (*Nestor productus*) being confined, as already mentioned, to Philip Island, is equally curious and unaccountable.

man, not being a collier, sees a horizon every day; but we presume that the most powerful of pedestrians never stepped on one, and probably never will, so long at least as the world continues round. Yet what is one man's centre is only a portion of another man's circle,—and so it is in ornithology. Species, rare towards their outer range, become common as we advance into their centre of dominion, while others which were previously common, on the same principle become extremely scarce, and soon afterwards seem to vanish from the earth. The one set has entered within, the other has passed beyond the ornithological horizon.

We shall now point out the more remarkable distinctive peculiarities, in respect to their feathered inhabitants, of Great Britain and Ireland, taking up the subject, though slightly, yet in systematic order. But as an introduction to the Emerald Isle, we shall first quote the following interesting passage from Mr. Thompson's valuable work, in illustration of the effect produced on birds, not apparently under man's dominion, by the industrial operations of the human race.

"I have remarked this particularly at one locality near Belfast, situated 500 feet above the sea, and backed by hills rising to 800 feet. Marshy ground, the abode of little else than the snipe, became drained, and that species was consequently expelled. As cultivation advanced, the numerous species of small birds attendant upon it, became visitors, and plantations soon made them inhabitants of the place. The land-rail soon haunted the meadows, the quail and the partridge the fields of grain. A pond, covering less than an acre of ground, tempted annually for the first few years, a pair of graceful and handsome sandpipers, (*Totanus hypoleucos*), which with their brood, appeared at the end of July or beginning of August, on their way to the seaside from their breeding haunt. This was in a moor about a mile distant, where a pair annually bred until driven away by drainage rendering it unsuitable. The pond was supplied by streams descending from the mountains, through wild and rocky glens, the favourite haunt of the water-ouzel, which visited its margin daily throughout the year. When the willows planted at the water's-edge had attained a goodly size, the splendid king-fisher occasionally visited it during autumn. Rarely do the water-ouzel and king-fisher meet 'to drink at the same pool;' but here they did so. So soon as there was sufficient cover for the water-hen, (*Gallinula chloropus*), it, an unbidden but most welcome guest, appeared and took up its permanent abode; a number of them frequently joining the poultry in the farm-yard at their repast. The heron, as if conscious that his deeds rendered him unwelcome, stealthily raised his 'blue bulk' aloft, and fled at our approach. The innocent and attractive

wagtails, both pied and grey, were of course always to be seen about the pond. A couple of wild-ducks, and two or three teal, occasionally at different seasons, became visitants; and once, early in October, a tufted duck (*Fuligula cristata*) arrived, and after remaining a few days, took its departure, but returned in company with two or three others of the same species. These went off several times, but returned on each occasion with an increase to their numbers, until above a dozen adorned the water with their presence. During severe frost, the woodcock was driven to the unfrozen rill dripping into it beneath a dense mass of foliage; and the snipe, together with the jack-snipe, appeared along the edge of the water. The titlark, too, visited it at such times. In summer, the swallow, house-martin, sand-martin, and swift, displayed their respective modes of flight in pursuit of prey above the surface of the pond. The sedge-warbler poured forth his imitative or mocking notes from the cover on the banks, as did the willow-wren its simple song. This bird was constantly to be seen ascending the branches and twigs of the willows (*Salix viminalis* chiefly) that overhung the water, for *Aphides* and other insect prey. In winter lesser redpools in little flocks were swayed gracefully about, while extracting food from the light and pendent branches of the alder-seed. Three species of tit (*Parus major*, *c. uleus* and *ater*), and the gold-crested *regulus*, appeared in lively and varied attitudes on the larch and other trees. In winter, also, and especially during frost, the wren and the hedger-accentor were sure to be seen threading their modest way among the entangled roots of the trees and brushwood, little elevated above the surface of the water.

"So far only, the pond and bordering foliage have been considered; many other species might be named as seen upon the trees. On the banks a few yards distant, fine Portugal laurels tempted the green-finch to take up its permanent residence, and served as a roost during the winter for many hundred linnets, which made known the place of their choice by congregating in some fine tall poplars that towered above the shrubs, and thence poured forth their evening jubilee.

"To name all the birds that cultivation, the erection of houses, the plantation of trees and shrubs, together with the attraction of a garden, brought to the place, would be tedious. It will therefore only be further observed, that the beautiful goldfinch, so long as a neighbouring hill-side was covered with thistles and other plants on the seeds of which it fed, visited the standard cherry trees to nidify; and the spotted flycatcher, which particularly delights in pleasure-grounds and gardens, annually spent the summer there. Of the six species of British *Merulida*, the resident missel and song-thrushes, and the black-bird inhabited the place; the fieldfare and redwing, winter visitants, were to be seen in their season; and the ring-ouzel annually during summer frequented an adjacent rocky glen. Curlews on their way from the sea to the mountain moor, occasionally alighted on the pasture fields. The entire number of species seen at this place (seventy-five English

acres in extent) was seventy; forty-one or forty-two of which bred there. A few others,—the kestrel, ring-ouzel, sand-martin, and quail, built in the immediate neighbourhood.”—*Birds of Ireland*, Preface to vol. i. p. 11.

That the planting of shrubs and trees, and the general operations of horticulture, tend to increase the number of birds is certain. Nearly seventy different species have been counted in Kensington Gardens. Rooks are often seen to settle in ancient groves, where they were formerly unknown, soon after villages or groups of houses have been erected in their neighbourhood. They frequently take up their abode on trees which, in consequence of the extension of towns, have become surrounded by the dwellings of man, and swallows, sparrows, thrushes, blackbirds, redbreasts, wrens, all desire to build their nests upon our houses.

Of the great raptorial order of birds of prey, (*Accipitres*), Ireland seems to possess her full share, all the truly British eagles, falcons, hawks, buzzards, kites, and owls, being found within her shores, although a few stray species, such as the swallow-tailed kite, (*Elanus furcatus*), the Egyptian vulture, (*Neophron percnopterus*), and several continental owls, (of casual occurrence in Britain,) have not as yet been seen there. On the other hand, the griffon vulture (*Vultur fulvus*) and the spotted eagle (*Aquila naevia*) have occurred in Ireland, and are unknown in England. The latter is supposed to have been seen in Skye. It is an inhabitant of the south and east of Europe. The common kite (*Falco milvus*) is very rare in Ireland.

Mr. Thompson gives us some curious particulars regarding that fine species, the golden eagle. A sporting friend assured him that when hunting among the Belfast mountains, one of those birds was seen soaring above the hounds “as they came to fault after a good chase.” As they gained the scent again, and were going at full cry, the eagle swooped down at a distance of three or four hundred yards in advance, and carried off the hare. In most works on Ornithology the golden eagle is characterized as indocile. But Mr. Langtry of Fort William, near Belfast, had some years ago a bird which was extremely tractable. It was, to be sure, a Scotch specimen, which may perhaps account for it. It became at once attached to its owner, and after a month’s confinement was restored to liberty and the use of its wings, but so far from abusing that liberty in the way of making off, it was found to return to the lure whenever called.

this eagle for the chase, it was hooded after the manner of a hunting hawk; but the practice was soon abandoned as unnecessary, in consequence of its remaining quiet and contented when carried on the arm of its master. It was unwilling indeed to leave him even to take flight, unless some special ‘quarry’ was in view. When at liberty for the day, and my friend appeared in sight at any distance, his arm was no sooner held out towards the affectionate bird, than it came hurriedly flying to perch upon it. I have, when in his company—for it was indifferent to the presence of strangers—seen it fly to him without any food being offered, not less than a dozen times within half an hour. When on the ground, and the lure was thrown comparatively near, this bird preferred running—which it could do very fast—to using its wings. It was also fed from the ‘fist.’ Live rats were several times turned out of the cage-trap to it, but before getting far away they were invariably pounced upon. Four full-grown rats have been taken at a meal; an entire heron, (*Ardea cinerea*), except the head and legs, was also eaten on one occasion. It differed somewhat in its manner of feeding from two sea eagles which were kept along with it; when the head and neck of a goose were offered, the golden eagle ate them wholly; the latter took the flesh off only, leaving the harder parts; and when entire birds were given, the sea eagle plucked many more feathers off than the golden,* the latter assimilating to the peregrine falcon in this respect. This golden eagle was more partial to alighting on trees than the sea eagles were. Flying from one group of them to another, it in this manner followed its master about the demesne, indolently remaining as long as possible where it perched, consistently with keeping him in sight. My friend discontinued any further training of this eagle, on account of its boldness, as it flew not only at well-grown eyegnets of the tame swans, but at the old birds themselves, which were obliged to take to the water for safety: it also flew at dogs.”—Vol. i. p. 10.

One of the largest eagle cages, (next to that of Mr. John Gregory, of Canaan Lodge, near Edinburgh,) of which we have chanced to hear, is that in Phoenix Park, Dublin. It was erected at the expense of Sir Philip Crampton, Bart., as a place of recreation for the larger carnivorous quadrupeds, but entirely failed in its intended purpose. When a tigress was placed in this expanded den, (thirty-six feet long, sixteen broad, sixteen high,) she quailed and trembled, and seemed most anxious to regain the confined shelter of her usual berth. A lioness and leopard would not enter it voluntarily, but had to be forced to play themselves. Soon after (of course in absence of the *Felinæ*), seven eagles were placed in it, and were found to

* “Birds up to the size of sparrows are eaten whole by the golden eagle; three sparrows have been taken in succession without a feather being plucked off.”

“As one of the first steps towards training

dwell together in amity. Various additions of the same kind were made from year to year, until at last (1845) the number of eagles placed in company amounted to seventeen—viz., three golden, two white-headed, and twelve sea eagles. They lived together, if not in heartfelt harmony, at least with an outward show of respect towards each other. Only one serious quarrel took place. A sea eagle pounced upon a golden one. The latter threw itself upon its back, when the former, with its talons, seized it by the legs, which made it almost faint with fear or pain, while the assailant gave forth a loud triumphant cry.

"I had some difficulty," says Mr. R. Ball, "in beating the bird off the other with a pole; it was removed from the cage, and shortly afterwards accidentally killed. On another occasion, a golden eagle was found drowned in the bath, a large trough, in which eagles delight to roll; it was supposed by the keeper to have been forced under water by one of the sea eagles, but more probably it got cramped, as the birds seem often to carry their bathing to excess. It is a remarkable fact, that a sea eagle but one year old seemed to be generally acknowledged as the superior of the whole. This bird seized the first piece of food thrown into the cage as its acknowledged right; but should any other eagle happen to get possession of it, the food was instantly given up on the approach of the young one, which when full grown, was about the largest of the flock. The bathing of eagles alluded to is remarkable. On observing that these birds, which in menageries are generally kept without water, exhibited a great desire to wash themselves, a large vessel was provided. When fresh water is put into this vessel, it is at once occupied by one of them, and surrounded by others waiting their turn for a dip; they eventually lie in it for some time, until completely wetted."

Mr. Gregory's golden eagles, (a fine pair from the lake of Killarney,) from which the *Feline* are not debarred, are in truth very fond of live cats. The female makes the first pounce, and usually eats about one half, leaving the other for her mate, who waits patiently till his time comes. The victim is first transfixed by the talons, near the upper portion of the spine, while the neck or throat is almost simultaneously pierced by the bill. Death is often nearly instantaneous, or extremely speedy—occasionally more prolonged, much depending on the success of the first pounce, something on the prowess and activity of the individual *Felis*.*

* Mr. Gregory's golden eagles have been frequently observed to swallow small birds entire without plucking—quite in accordance with what is mentioned by Mr. Thompson in the preceding note. An Irish bird-trapper, much employed by Mr. G., (both for *Feline* and fowls of the air,) gave them more

In relation to the smaller accipitrine birds, we may state that the merlin (*Falco aesalon*) is indigenous in both the north and south of Ireland. It breeds upon the ground, generally in wild and moorland districts, and although not a bird of passage, it ranges with the season, being more frequent in lowland cultivated counties in winter than in summer. We once saw it dart from the centre of a large silver fir-tree, near Stranraer, in the month of July, and presumed it had there and then its nest; but as the general opinion seems to be of one accord, that it always builds upon the ground, our arboreal exception may have been merely resting itself after a flight. We have never chanced to see this species hovering after the mode so beautifully described by the Ettrick Shepherd,—

"And the merlin hung in the middle air,
With his little wings outspread,
As if let down from the heavens there
By a viewless silken thread."

It may be that the well-known "windhover," commonly called the kestrel, (*Falco tinnunculus*;) is here meant, though misnamed. Many errors of this kind creep into poetry, where a dreamy rather than discriminate view is sometimes taken of the actualities of nature, and so fact and fiction become blended into a peculiar and delusive *tertium quid*, which is neither one nor other. In all our ballad poetry there is a perpetual reference to the *Goshawk*, a species which is not historically known in our border countries, which has never been seen to breed there, in modern times, and was no doubt substituted by the minstrels in room of the more frequent peregrine.

The kestrel, already named, though well known in Ireland, is much less numerous there than in Britain. This is supposed to be in some measure accounted for by the well-known fact, that there are no field-mice (*Arvicola*) in Ireland, and very few shrews.*

than once a small flock of green linnets, which they snapped up and swallowed, feathers and all, each at a single, almost instantaneous, mouthful. A soft-hearted ornithologist, on a certain occasion, remonstrated with the son of Erin as to the possible cruelty of thus feeding the eagles with living linnets. "And is it bad for the eagles? please your honour," he immediately replied, in great alarm. Here the conversation was allowed to drop;

"The force of nature could no further go."

* Among the British quadrupeds, we may here note, that the pole-cat, squirrel, dormouse, and mole, are all unknown in Ireland. Even our common hare (*Lepus timidus*) is absent, being represented by a peculiar Irish species not found in Britain, *Lepus Hibernicus*. The species of bats in Ireland are very few compared with those of Britain, especially of England.

These small mammalia form the favourite food of the kestrel, which, however, preys also on insects, lizards, and little birds. Some naturalists deny that it attacks birds at all, but that it does so is certain. Mr. Garrett states, that the ivy-covered gable of his house, near Belfast, tenanted by numerous sparrows, was almost daily visited at sunset by a kestrel, which always captured and carried off a bird from among the congregated roosters. However, on examining the interior of this species, it will generally be found to contain the debris of beetles. It has been seen hawking for cock-chafers towards evening, and preying upon them in the air (from hand to mouth) without alighting.

There is no distinct proof that the true goshawk (*Falco palumbarius*) has been ever seen in Ireland. As a European species it is widely spread, but the American bird, (*Falco atricapillus*), though closely allied, is representative rather than identical. As a breeding bird the goshawk is certainly not now a British species, though stray examples are sometimes met with.

The generality of our British Owls are found in Ireland; but our common brown species (*Strix stridula*) is scarcely known there. It is also extremely rare in the north of Scotland. The most beautiful, and one of the largest birds of this group, the great snowy-owl (*Strix nyctea*) of Iceland and the Arctic regions, occurs occasionally in Ireland, although less frequently than in Shetland and the north of Lewis. The discovery of the breeding place of this fine species, is a point well worthy of being attempted by the ornithologists of the rising generation. It is not seldom seen in the Island of Unst, the most northern pendicle of the British kingdom, and nearly half-a-dozen specimens were obtained in the neighbourhood of the Butt of Lewis, during the summer of 1850. Several were also killed in Caithness. Their nests have never been discovered. The notion entertained by some of the natives (of Lewis), with whom we conversed upon the subject, was, that these birds build there on stony islets in the midst of moorland lochs—situations certainly of great security, as there are now no boats on those upland waters. We examined several specimens, and found them well-conditioned, fully feathered birds, but from the great prevalence of dusky spots and bars, they were probably “two year olds.” We are not aware that a perfectly mature specimen, that is, with the plumage of a pure white, with distinct dark-coloured markings, has ever been found among us till the conclusion of the breeding season, in which case they may have formed

only a portion of the winter migration from the far north. This species frequently hunts by day, as indeed all Arctic owls must necessarily do, being inhabitants of countries where a “sleepless summer of long light” knows nothing of the gloom of our nocturnal darkness. Besides its love of hares, (from whence its Swedish name of *Harfang*), rabbits, and feathered game, it is a very dexterous fisher, sailing over the placid waters as soft and silent as a wreath of snow, but striking from time to time its talons through the back of unsuspecting fish, and bearing it off to craggy knoll or leafy arbour. It has been remarked that there are few things more completely out of place than a trout on the top of a tall tree.

Owls in general are supposed to be very useful in preventing the increase of the smaller quadrupeds, (Mr. Ball took nine mice from the stomach of a single bird,) and on this account are in many places held in high esteem. A white owl is regarded as sacred in Arabia, because when Mahomet, pursued by his enemies, was on the point of being discovered in a cave where he had taken refuge, one of these birds flew from it, and his assailants immediately returned upon their steps, concluding that no one could have previously entered it. But so far from being deemed sacred, they are eaten in Norfolk, where the people, even in a land of turkeys, have a saying, “as tender as a boiled owl.”

We shall next take a brief survey of a few of the Insessorial or perching birds, among which are included all our smaller land-birds and songsters, as well as crows, pies, &c.

Of the shrikes, the red-backed species, (*Lanius collurio*), common in all the southern and western counties of England, and well known in Wales, has not yet made its way to Ireland. At this we rather wonder, as it is a bird of buoyant wing.

That delightful bird, the dipper, or water-ouzel, (*Cinclus aquaticus*), which forms so familiar and enlivening a feature of our rocky streams and torrents, is common over Ireland, as in Britain, wherever suitable localities occur. During winter many migrate to the lakes and lower streams, but they are most abundant in the breeding season among the upland tributaries. We have never seen them perch on trees, although Mr. Thompson says they do so.

“About the ponds at Wolf-hill, an elevated situation near Belfast, where these birds have chiefly come under my observation, the willows that fringe the bank are, owing to the absence of stones, their constant perch. Contiguous to these ponds are rocky mountain streams, by which they are supplied. The water-ouzel is

described by Montagu and Selby merely as a very early songster. In the north of Ireland its song is occasionally heard at all seasons; and more especially when other birds are silent, as in the autumnal, and still more frequently the winter months. The bright mornings and forenoons that occur during the most severe frost and snow, have always seemed to me its favourite time for song, which it pours forth when quickly flying at a great height, as well as when perched just above the water."—Vol. i. p. 116.

Although associated in our own mind with the most lonely places,—secluded upland vales, encompassed by the "pastoral melancholy" of the green mountains, the dipper is often seen along the umbrageous banks of larger rivers, where, with a darker background, its pure white breast shines like a little ball of snow. Neither is it shy of human neighbourhood, as well observed by Sir William Jardine.

"If civilisation has encroached on its retreats, and machinery or mills have been in consequence erected, it accommodates itself to the change, loses its secluded habits, and seems even to enjoy the bustle. It may often be seen perched on the inner spokes of the mill-wheel, singing its lowly song; and we have known it breed within the passage of the torrent which drove it. In such places they live in pairs, each having, as it were, a locality or limit within which they range, and where they select an appropriate situation for the nest. When about to alight, they usually drop or splash into the pools or streams, and seldom settle at once upon the stones or rocks. They are among our most pleasing songsters, although, from the lowness of their notes, not often heard; but to the angler who plies his rod at all hours, and in the most sequestered places, it is a well-known and welcome strain. It may be heard during the whole year, but spring and the breeding season are the periods when it may be most frequently enjoyed. Being early breeders, this sign of the coming year is often heard in February; while the streams are still bound up in ice; and a clear and shining morning at this early time, will be sure to display some of those cleanly songsters perched on a prominent stone or stick, or on the edge of a frozen pool, warbling their notes just audible above the murmurs of the stream. Their breeding-places are chosen close to the brook or river, and often in curious situations. The nest is generally constructed under some brow or overhanging rock, or among the matted roots of a tree; at other times under some fall, which is projected over a space, hollow and comparatively dry within, or beneath the dam or weir which serves to turn off the

water to supply the mill; and we have once or twice observed it under the very sluice of the wheel. In the latter situation the parent bird dashes through the face of the rushing waters when about to enter the nest, and seems to enjoy the act, entering and retreating two or three times before commencing her seat."*

Sir William Jardine adds, that the practice of perching on the neighbouring willows, as mentioned by Mr. Thompson, is unusual, even in valleys fringed with wood. A stem, or fallen branch arrested in the stream, may be sought for, but he has never seen them inclined to perch upon the overhanging or adjoining branches, and refers their doing so to something special in the place. The food of the dipper is aquatic larvæ, and occasionally sticklebacks, and other small fishes. We know of no proof that the ova of salmon form its favourite food. It is greatly persecuted in the north of Scotland, on account of its supposed depredations among the spawning beds, and we formerly received an authenticated report from a factor of the Duke of Sutherland's, that 548 dippers had been purposely destroyed in a single Highland district during a period of three years. Whatever may have caused the decrease of salmon, we hold the water ouzel less blamable than the water-bailiff, although even he may be sometimes more sinned against than sinning.

A peculiar habit of the dipper, and one from which it no doubt has obtained both its name and opprobrious character as a poacher, consists in its sinking or walking into the water, and then proceeding to search for insect food among the submerged stones and gravel. "The assertion," says Mr. Yarrell, "of its walking below the water, which some persons have ventured, is not made good by observation, nor countenanced by reason." We infer that this bird is rare in the south of England, else so observant an ornithologist would, in the course of his inquiries, have had the ocular proof. It is curious that a bird so abundant in the north of Scotland should not have made its way into the Orkney and Shetland Islands. We are not sure that it is even a Hebridean native. We know not why Acerbi should allege that it is not an Italian species, although he gives no better authority than his own for a statement which is not a fact.†

* *Naturalist's Library.* Ornithology. Vol. xi. p. 67.

† "I torrenti de' monti alti," says Professor Savi, "che han sempre acque limpide e fresche, sono la dimora de' Merli acquajoli. Là ne' siti più cupi e più adombrati, e ne' forroni profondi, van sempre visitando il margine delle acque, e spesso ancora si

We shall conclude our notice of this species, which is *par excellence* the angler's bird, being often for many an hour the only one he either sees or hears, with a brief record of our last encounter with it. While angling from a boat on Loch Tummel, at a considerable distance from the shore, an unexpected water-ousel flew suddenly beneath our outstretched rod, and then precipitately tumbled into the water and disappeared from view. Almost simultaneously a momentary rushing sound was heard through the still air, so close at hand as almost to be felt, and a large peregrine falcon swooped across the bow of the boat, and then curving gracefully upwards, darted away in rapid flight. In a few seconds uprose the dipper to the surface, and casting back the waters from its feathery mantle, with a peculiar motion of the wings, different from that of duck or diver, flew off in safety to its usual shore. It had evidently, when pursued, and about to be overtaken and slain upon the open waters, instinctively sought the protecting presence of the angler and his boat.

All the British thrushes, including the blackbird and rock-ousel, occur in Ireland, and, in addition, the gold-vented thrush (*T. aurigaster*) has been once shot near Waterford. It is an African bird, described by Le Vaillant under the name of *Cudor*, as dwelling on the banks of the Grootvis, in the Caffre country. It is remarkable that the missel thrush (*T. viscivorus*) should have been scarcely known in Ireland till of late years, although now a resident species, "pretty generally distributed over wooded districts." It is a bold, pugnacious bird, drives off magpies, and even the smaller hawks, from its own vicinity, and will sometimes strike at the head or hat of human beings who venture too near its nest.

We must here pass over the red-breast, and many other sweet singers of Irish melodies. The absence of that great nocturnal chorister, the nightingale, has already been deplored. Neither does the beautiful blue-throated redstart (*Phœnicura suecica*) ever venture so far west as Ireland. It is one of those numerous summer residents which migrate from Africa into Europe in spring, and spread far northwards into Scandinavia, a few stragglers sometimes shewing themselves upon the eastern coasts of England.

tuffano sotto di queste per cercare gli insetti loro ordinario cibo. Sono uccelli sedentari, e solo quando ne' giorno i più freddi tutte le acque de' torrenti montani son gelate, allora calano ne' fiumi e ne' fossi de' colli più bassi, ma giammai vengono in pianura." *Ornithologia Toscana*, tom. i. p. 201. "Abita nell'Italia, ed in molte altri parti d'Europa." Ranzani, in *Elementi de Zoologia*, tom. iii. part v. p. 213.

All the titmice found in Britain occur also in the sister isle, except a rare Scottish species called the crested tit, (*Parus cristatus*). The same may be said of the wag-tails, with a like exception of the blue-headed kind (*Motacilla neglecta* of Gould). The skylark rejoices over all Ireland,—the wood-lark (which we have never found in Scotland) is there a residing, but very local species.

Passing over numerous finches, linnets, buntings, &c., found in both islands, we come to the *Corvidæ*, or crow tribe, of which Ireland possesses as many as can be reasonably expected, that is all that are British, except the nutcracker, (*Corvus caryocatactes*), which, besides being merely an accidental bird in England, is scarcely a crow at all. The raven, (*Corvus corax*), which is the king of crows, is distributed over all Ireland. It has been much disputed among naturalists, whether birds which feed on carrion or other garbage distinguish their prey by the sense of sight or smell. As so many species feed on living prey which emit no strong or even perceptible odour, we should *a priori* incline to the belief that the eyes are fully more essential than the nose.

"On one occasion," says Mr. Thompson, "I had interesting evidence of the power of sight in the raven. A nest of young rats, not more than three or four days old, had been dug up in a stubble field, and, after being killed, were left there. Very soon afterwards, two or three ravens passed over the place at a great height, and, on coming above the spot, dropped almost directly down upon them. The young rats had not been ten minutes dead at the time, and consequently could hardly have emitted any effluvia. Besides, they were so small, that, even had they given out any to the air, it seems hardly possible that the odour could have ascended to the great elevation at which the birds had been. Sight alone, I conceive, must in this instance have been the guiding sense."—Vol. i. p. 305.

We think so too. The carrion crow (*Corvus corone*) is rather a rare bird in Ireland, and does not seem to have existed there at all in earlier times. In an old tract, printed for the Irish Archæological Society, titled 'A Brief description of Ireland, made in this year 1589, by Robert Payne,' it is recorded that "There is not that place in Ireland where any venomous things will live. There is neither mol, pye, nor carrion crow." The editor, who rejoices in the somewhat ornithological name of Dr. Aquila Smith, adds, in a note, that there is no authority as to the introduction of the carrion crow into the island; and that Moryson (who wrote in 1617) confirms Payne, by stating,—“We have not the blacke crow; but only crows of mingled colour, such as

wee call Royston crows." The magpie (*Pica caudata*) is said to be an imported rather than an original species in Ireland. Although a bird of singular beauty, and, in confinement apt to learn, it is a mischievous creature, and why it should have been imported no one knows. Derricke, who wrote his "Image of Ireland" in Queen Elizabeth's time, has recorded that,

"No pies to pluck the thatch from house
Are breed in Irishe groundes,
But worse than pies, the same to burne,
A thousande may be founde."

Smith, in his "History of the County of Cork," published in 1749, observes that the magpie, "was not known in Ireland seventy years ago, but is now very common;" and Rutt, in his "Natural History of Dublin," states that "it is a foreigner, naturalized here since the latter end of King James the Second's reign, and it is said to have been driven hither by a strong wind." In the "Journal to Stella," Dean Swift makes allusion to the same bird: "Pray observe the inhabitants about Wexford; they are old English; see what they have particular in their manners, name, and language. Magpies have been always there, and no where else in Ireland, till of late years." Mr. Ogilby's commentary (as given by Mr. Yarrell) on this last quotation is as follows:—

"It must be confessed that the testimony afforded by this passage is not so explicit as could be wished. That the magpie existed always, or, in other words, was indigenous to the vicinity of Wexford, and to no other part of the country, is scarcely credible, even if it were not directly contradicted by Derricke. That it might have continued to be a local denizen for a considerable time after its introduction is more probable, and more in accordance with the habits of the bird: and this circumstance of its locality probably gave origin to the popular idea expressed by Swift of its being indigenous to the county of Wexford. We may, however, conclude with greater certainty—for on this point our authority is express—that it was only in the reign of Queen Anne that the bird began to spread generally over the kingdom; that is, at the same period as the introduction of frogs; and indeed I have sometimes heard these two events spoken of traditionally as having been simultaneous. The town of Wexford is remarkable as having been the first place of strength in the island which was reduced and colonized by the English. Even to the present day, the majority of the inhabitants of that part of the country are of English ex-

traction; and it is not improbable that their forefathers brought the magpie with them from England, perhaps as a pet, to put them in mind of their native land; for it is scarcely possible that any one would voluntarily introduce so mischievous a creature. At all events, St. Patrick's curse, which is said to rest so heavily on the whole tribe of serpents, does not appear to have extended to frogs and magpies, for I know no part of the world where both breeds thrive better or faster than in Ireland."—*British Birds*, vol. i. p. 112.

In confirmation of this statement, Mr. Thompson informs us that Lord Roden's keeper, by ranging the country for some miles around Tullymore Park, and by robbing nests, and shooting and trapping old birds, destroyed during the half year of 1836 above 730 eggs and magpies. The species, from whatever quarter first derived, has been long common over all Ireland. Its congener the Jay (*Garrulus glandarius*) occurs only in the southern districts.

Although Ireland is not destitute of fine timber, it is by no means an arboreal country, and we consequently find that woodpeckers are rare, as we know them to be in North Britain, where none have been ever ascertained to breed. The great spotted species (*Picus major*) is of accidental occurrence in Ireland. The green woodpecker (*P. viridis*) is reported to have bred in some well-wooded districts; but this fact requires confirmation. The cuckoo is a regular spring visitant over Ireland, and all the British swifts and swallows are also found there. The kingfisher is distributed, though sparingly, throughout the island. The night-jar is of more local occurrence.

The great order called *Rasores* (or Gallinaceous birds,) includes among our native species pigeons, pheasants, partridges, and grouse. Ireland possesses all the British pigeons, except a woodland species of stock-dove (*Columba oenas*) found in the midland counties of England, and as yet unknown to Scotland. The turtle-dove (*C. turtur*) is more frequent in Ireland than in the northern parts of our own island.

Of game birds, the pheasant (*Phasianus colchicus*) though originally not even a European species, has been long introduced to, and is now well spread over various wooded parts of Ireland. The period of its importation is unrecorded, but so far back as 1589 old Payne remarks, that "there be great store of pheasantes" in the island, and Fynes Moryson, who lived there from 1599 till 1603, states that there are "such plenty of pheasants, as I have known sixty served up at one feast, and abound much more with

rails, but partridges are scarce." From the quantity of insect food devoured by these birds, it is the opinion of many, notwithstanding the great agricultural outcry regarding game, that they do more good than harm to the farmer.* The capercaillie or cock of the wood (*Tetrao urogallus*) though once well known, has been extinct in Ireland for nearly a century. The name is supposed to be derived from the Celtic *cappulcaille*, which we understand to signify *horse of the woods*, in reference no doubt to the bird's super-eminent size; just as people still talk of horse-mackerel, horse-flies, horse-léeches, and, when the expression of merriment is somewhat uncontrolled, horse-laughter. The black-cock (*Tetrao tetrix*) notwithstanding its abundance on the opposite coast and neighbouring isles of Scotland, is *not* an Irish species. The natural constitution of the country would seem well adapted to its habits, but it may be presumed that the bird thinks otherwise. Various attempts have been made by Lords O'Neil, Courtown, and others, to naturalize them by means of birds brought over from Scotland, but hitherto without success. They are seen to remain for a time in the district where they have been placed, but they diminish instead of increasing in numbers, and ere long entirely disappear. Our common red-grouse or moor-game (*T. Scoticus*) is well known over many of the extensive heathy districts of the sister isle. The white-grouse or ptarmigan (*T. Lagopus*) as formerly stated, is quite unknown. We believe it is now extinct in both England and Wales.† The partridge is found pretty generally distributed over cultivated grounds and their vicinity, but is much less abundant than in Britain, and has been gradually decreasing till within these last few years, during which this agricultural kind of game has begun to rally.

We shall conclude the rasorial order with a word or two on quails, the history of which is somewhat peculiar in Ireland. It is well known alike to naturalists and sportsmen, (of

late years we have rejoiced to see several examples of the character of both combined,) that the quail is a migratory bird, arriving in spring, and spreading, prior to the breeding season, over a great portion of England, and, though much more sparingly, our own country. We have ourselves traced it in many parts of Scotland, but not further north than the side of Loch Achilty, in Ross-shire. The great majority of European quails retire to Africa in winter. The islands of the Archipelago are covered by them, as resting places during certain seasons of the year. Early in autumn such quantities are captured in the island of Capri, near Naples, as in former times to have afforded the Bishop so great a portion of his revenue, that he was called in consequence the Bishop of Quails. On the other hand, in spring, such flights arrive on the western shores of the Neapolitan kingdom, that one hundred thousand have been taken in a day. The species is widely spread over Asia Minor, along the shores of the Red Sea, and is well known in India. Now as it migrates in such prodigious numbers, and is the only species of the genus ascertained to do so, additional interest attaches to it as the probable means by which the Israelites were fed in the wilderness.

"He rained flesh also upon them as dust, and feathered fowls like as the sand of the sea; and he let it fall in the midst of their camp, round about their habitations."—*Psalms* lxxviii. 27, 28.

Although the quail is in general a bird of passage, certain exceptions seem to occur even in Europe. It is said to remain throughout the year in Portugal, and there is now no doubt of the singular fact that it does so in Ireland,—a curious coincidence,—these two countries being the most western of the European territories, lying in the same longitude, and being equally under the influence during winter of the ameliorating effect of the great Atlantic waters. There is, in truth, so little frost in Ireland, that these birds may easily obtain their food all the year round, and it is the deficiency of food rather than the fear of cold which seems to influence the movements of many migratory species. From 120 to 300 brace of quails have been killed in Ireland by single sportsmen during the winter season. In regard to the occurrence of the species in Portugal during that season, although we think it highly probable, we do not state the fact upon our own knowledge, but on the authority of Colonel Montagu, (*Supplement to Ornithological Dictionary*), who obtained his information from Captain Latham. We know too little of the ornithology of the great western peninsula of Europe. If the quail is actually found in

* *Observations on Game and the Game Laws.* By J. Burn Murdoch, Esq.

It may be here noted, that the present Secretary of State for the Foreign Department, formerly addressed an epistle on this subject to the late Secretary of State for the Home Department. See Letter from the Earl of Malmesbury to Sir George Grey, "On the Revision of the Game Laws," 1848.

† As the ptarmigan is a very hardy species, and does not occur in warm countries except at great heights, near the line of perpetual snow, it may be that the more southern position of Ireland makes that country too hot to hold it. We presume that the Island of Islay is the most southern locality in which the species is now found in the British dominions.

Portugal all winter, it is certainly singular that it should not be so in Galicia, (its natural continuation,) the most northern province of Spain, and politically rather than physically distinct from Portugal. In the only work we have at hand relating to that part of Spain, the quail is said to be,—“*Comun en toda Galicia. Se presenta in primavera, y emigra en estio.*”*

Two important and productive orders, the shore-birds or waders, (*Grallatores*), and the web-footed or swimming-birds, (*Natatores*), still remain to be considered; but the unforeseen length to which this article has already extended, requires that we should postpone their exposition to a future Number.

ART. III.—*Scriptural Revision of the Liturgy, a Remedy for Anglican Assumption and Papal Aggression. A Letter to the Right Honourable Lord John Russell, M.P.* By a MEMBER of the MIDDLE TEMPLE. London, 1851.

THE Book of Common Prayer is the very kernel of the Church of England. The Liturgy has probably no rival in the affections of the English nation. The exquisite beauty and majesty of its language, the simplicity and dignity of its ritual, the richness and sweetness of its melody, the touching harmony of its cadences, the depth, warmth, and elevation of its devotional spirit, have for ages soothed the feelings, stimulated the piety, and earned the reverence of a great and religious people. We cannot wonder at the exhibition of such phenomena. The Liturgy is the precious tradition of the religious feeling and most exalted aspirations of many centuries of Christianity. All that the most saintly men, under every circumstance of human life and human emotion, have felt in the depth of their souls and poured forth to the God of their adoration—all that the bitterness of the keenest penitence, or the resignation of the profoundest suffering, or the fervour of Christian hope, or the exultation of triumphant faith, or the submission of the sincerest humility, or the intensity of the most earnest prayer has conceived and uttered, is here treasured up for the sustaining of Christian life and perpetuating of Christian feeling during unnumbered generations.

It is a striking testimony to the intrinsic excellence of the Liturgy, and to the fidelity and purity with which it expresses the genuine spirit of Christianity, that though descended from such remote antiquity it has lost none of its original freshness. It is as serviceable for the present generation, as thoroughly adapted to the utterance of our profoundest, as also of our most varied and delicate feelings, as if it had been composed in our own day. Nay, it is more so; for without meaning any disrespect to Archbishops of Canterbury, who, it may be confidently asked, on hearing the occasional prayers put forth from time to time by the authority of the Queen in Council, has not been struck by the very perceptible discord between the new and the old, and has not found the additions of modern composition to fall short in power and beauty of language as well as in depth and simplicity of feeling?

The musical and rhetorical excellence of the Liturgy will excite greater surprise, when it is remembered that, for the most part, it consists of translations from Latin. What other work can be placed by its side, in which a literal version from a foreign tongue is felt to surpass native and original compositions in harmony, richness, dignity, and variety of expression? What English prose will venture to challenge a comparison with the majesty and melody of the collects? Shakespeare and Milton may have equalled them by the happiest efforts of their genius: we know of no prose writing that could bear such a trial.

The cause of the superiority is plain. The Liturgy is the choicest selection of what has been proved to be best during a long lapse of time. Its litanies and its collects are the fruit of the most sublime piety and the noblest gifts of language, tested by long sustained trial. Had they not sprung from the inmost depths of human nature, thoroughly penetrated and christianized by religion, they never would have retained their pre-eminence in public worship, much less have continued to be a living fountain of devotion for the nineteenth as truly as for the sixth century. No single generation could have created or could replace the Liturgy. It is the accumulation of the treasures with which the most diversified experience, the most fervent devotion, and the most exalted genius, have enriched the worship of prayer and praise during fifteen hundred years. Who, then, can overestimate its influence in perpetuating the sacred fire of Christian love and Christian faith amongst a whole people, or exaggerate its power in conserving the pure and apostolical type of Christian worship?

* Catalogo de las aves observadas en las cercanias de Santiago, y otros puntos de Galicia. Por D. Francisco de los Rios Naceyro. See *Memorias de la Real Academia de Ciencias de Madrid*, tom. i. p. 110.

Nevertheless, the Liturgy is a work of mortal origin; and, be it never forgotten, must bear the impress of human frailty. We must not be idolaters even of what is good and holy; for idolatry is the ruin of the soul. The reverence felt for saintly piety has often betrayed admiration into extenuating, and not seldom into imitating, the failings which accompanied it. An indiscriminate veneration for a Liturgy may easily become the parent of fearful evil, by perpetuating and consecrating in extensive churches errors both of feeling and doctrine. The higher the image of Christian virtue the more imminent is the danger incurred by undiscerning admiration. The Liturgy, though a genuine emanation from the pure spirit of Christianity, has not been endowed with the infallibility of inspiration. The manner of its construction has exposed it to inevitable detriment. It was impossible that the effusions of a long series of worshippers should not be tinged by the colour of thought of the ages in which they lived. No man can escape wholly the influence of his time. The philosophy and doctrinal views of each passing century could not fail to imprint their stamp on the language even of prayer, much more on that of creeds and declarations of doctrine. It is no dishonour to the Liturgy that it is subject to the universal law of humanity. English clergymen, indeed, often speak of it in terms which place it on a level with the Bible, thereby conferring on it a practical infallibility, warranted neither by fact nor Scripture. Carried away by the admitted goodness of what they exalt, they become careless of observing strict accuracy in the expressions which they apply to it. They little suspect the guilt they are incurring by sowing the seeds of idolatry, and are as little aware that the conversion of respect and love into superstition has been the prolific source of most of the corruptions which have marred and disgraced the Christian religion.

It may be said that this necessary admixture of error furnishes a strong objection against the adoption of a fixed form of prayer. It cannot be denied that the objection has some foundation of truth; the weight, however, to be attached to it is a matter of difficult determination, which must vary very much at different times, and must depend on the particular form of prayer adopted and the temper and circumstances of each church. It is not our object in this article to discuss the relative advantages of a permanent Liturgy and of the extempore ministrations of the prophetic office, as adopted in the Presbyterian churches. We are dealing with the Liturgy of the Church

of England as an established fact, based on the predilections, or prejudices, if they so are called, of the English people; but in regard to this special objection to liturgies, we may remark that it applies with greater force to creeds and formularies of doctrine, such as all Churches possess, than to public prayer; for the scientific language of such statements is more intimately connected with the intellectual and philosophical development of the age in which they were framed, is more directly local and temporary than the more general outpourings of prayer. The language of the affections of the heart, whether in worship or poetry, is universal; it belongs to all times and places, and is little influenced by the revolution of years; whilst declarations of formal theology, involving of necessity scientific views of philosophy, are sure to be coloured by the intellectual state of those who reason them out from the revelations of Scripture.

It is a very remarkable fact, that the Liturgy, whose participation—to whatever extent—in human weakness no intelligent man will dispute, should have withstood unchanged the buffeting winds and waves of human opinion during three centuries of Protestantism, centuries distinguished by restless activity of thought, by violent fluctuations of theological views, by a mighty progress in literary development, and by the boldest challenging of the foundation of all intellectual and religious belief. The amount of gold contained in the Liturgy, when compared with the dross, will partly account for this striking occurrence: the remainder of the explanation will be supplied by the historical position of the Church of England. That Church is so intimately mixed up with the civil polity of this country as to form a very prominent and integral part of its constitution; and thus it has been protected by the tenacity with which the English have always elung to their institutions, and the vigour with which any organic change in them has been invariably resisted. The prescription of habitual reverence made the people slow to discern blemishes in the natural nobleness of their Liturgy; and even if their existence had been admitted, it would have required the irritation of positive harm created by them to reconcile the bulk of the nation to alterations in services consecrated by long use and devotional tenderness. Moreover, the Church of England is a Church of compromise: she shares the peculiar characteristic of all English institutions. Her constitution was framed with the express design of embracing diverse and antagonistic elements as certainly as the secular polity comprehends Whigs

and Tories, Free Traders and Protectionists. History bears witness to the practical carrying out of the intention which animated her founders. The Church of England has ever since her birth manifested herself as a broad and comprehensive Church, chequered by a wide variety of religious opinions. The co-existence of diverse and often mutually repulsive parties within the communion of the Established Church has been recognised and sanctioned by the national feeling. The sense of the country would be as greatly shocked by a proposal to make the Church more homogeneous by the ejection of one of its elements, as by an attempt to render the nation more uniform by the suppression of a political party. This comprehension of conflicting views within one Church is doubtless a matter open to much debate; its propriety has been vehemently questioned on theoretical grounds, but its practical existence is indisputable. The people of England have been long habituated to hear opposite doctrines from the same pulpit, to see bishop arrayed against bishop, and to have High Churchmen and Evangelical succeeding each other in the same parish: such was the Church which their fathers handed down to them, and if only moderation will repress extravagance and exclusiveness, they do not desire that it should be otherwise. Hence the forbearance and respect shewn towards a minority by the majority of the day; hence also the reluctance to make innovations in the Liturgy. No portion of it, however offensive to the views of many, has ever been destitute of the support of sincere defenders; and invincible has been the unwillingness to remove what was thought erroneous at the cost of expelling a large body of members from the communion of the Church. To give absolute predominance to one set of religious opinions by the alienation of all others would be felt to be a revolution amounting not to a reform but to a total reconstruction of the Church of England.

But even if changes had been desired by the Church at large, the machinery for accomplishing them was wanting. The Church of England came forth at the Reformation, like Minerva from the head of Jove, of full-grown stature: no means for subsequent development were provided. The Parliament became the legislature of the Church, and that legislature has ever shewn itself to be most averse to entertaining any project for the modification of that Church. The sentiment is natural. Indisputably it has been the ægis of the establishment, and the chief instrument of its preservation. At no time has Parliament been a suitable arena

for the discussion of doctrine; and the difficulty has greatly increased in later times. Who that loves the Church and values the services which she renders to religion, could desire to see her constitution the subject of incessant debate in the House of Commons? Which of her friends would not mourn, if every ecclesiastical theorist in Parliament, every enthusiast of every party, every non-conformist of the many sects who now have seats in the legislature, could raise unceasing motions on her articles, her creeds, her worship, and her institutions? Who is not conscious that her dissolution would be close at hand? But if this deeply rooted feeling works good, it has also its alloy of evil. Its tendency is to stereotype every part of the Church's constitution, to render all change impossible, to prevent improvement, however urgently it may be needed, or however innocent it may be of interfering with a single vital principle of the Church's doctrine. It requires almost as strong an effort—there are almost as many obstacles to be surmounted—to make an alteration in a service, or to omit a phrase in a prayer, as would be required to abolish or remake the Liturgy. Can it therefore be a matter for surprise that the Liturgy should retain unchanged the stamp which was impressed upon it in the 16th century? The Restoration offered a rare and valuable opportunity for introducing modifications, and also for providing some means for amelioration of detail from time to time; for the whole Liturgy had to be re-enacted in Parliament; but the fury of the political reaction clamoured blindly for the simple restoration of those old forms both in Church and State which had been swept away. It refused to see defects: it hated every improvement that savoured of recent progress. Such as the Church had been for a century, such it was decreed it should continue for ever! and, with a few slight alterations, the Liturgy of Queen Elizabeth was reincorporated into the English constitution.

It cannot be denied that the Church of England is hereby exposed to a very formidable danger. An institution which never varies is doomed by the law of mutability which acts on everything else to get out of harmony in some of its parts with the world that surrounds it: and thus one or other of two consequences is wont to occur. It more commonly happens that the parts which have ceased to be applicable to the wants and feelings of a new generation grow obsolete—their existence is ignored—words, if required to be used, are evaded by the help of a non-natural sense, or are looked upon as simply unmeaning sounds; the concurrent

interpretation of society being held to be authorized to change and even reverse the ordinary meaning of language, though avowedly and intentionally employed in the most binding strictness. By such a process men have reconciled themselves to take oaths, whose obligations they had no intention whatever of observing, and have subscribed formularies whose import they repudiated. Whatever may be thought of the morality of such acts, when universal consent has ratified the perversion, and the *animus imponentis* may be said to justify the accepting of the obligation as either wholly nugatory, or as reversing the pledge, it is at least clear, that whilst the change of opinion is in progress, and before all are agreed as to the virtual repeal of the natural sense, much stress must be laid upon individual consciences, much temptation to untruth brought to bear on many, much damage inflicted on the moral character, (and that just in proportion as the conscience is tender,) and much hardship and loss entailed on those who refuse to take a pledge which they still understand to mean what its words set forth.

This, however, is not the usual course with religious services. The language of daily prayer can hardly ever grow dead; the feelings of every thinking man recoil from addressing words to God, which do not mean what they seem to say. The hardening of the conscience, though not wholly unavoidable, will seldom be the chief evil produced by a long unchanged liturgy. The sense of the unsuitableness of the offending portion will remain awake; it will gradually strengthen into dislike, and dislike into hostility, and thus, the healing hand of reform being withheld, the dammed up waters of revolution will ever threaten destruction in the back-ground. Those who have seen this peril averted in secular affairs by an amount of change which fell little short of a revolution, may yet live to see a similar danger, but we fear with a surer and more ruinous catastrophe, assail the Church of England. Symptoms of internal fermentation, of that commotion of mind which usually precedes a national convulsion, have already been neither few nor insignificant. The religious and intellectual characteristics of our times are peculiarly calculated to bring on and augment this danger. We live in an age of great intellectual activity and great religious earnestness. Individual men of more towering understandings have existed at other periods of our history; but never before has mental energy been so universally developed, or first principles explored with such acuteness and daring fearlessness. Never

before were the results of thought diffused so quickly through the community, or carried out in action with such ready power and accumulated support. On the other hand, highly as the religiousness of other epochs has been vaunted, we doubt whether deep religious earnestness was ever so general among the upper classes as it is now. Respect for religion has increased on every side. Religion is now honoured where it was wont to encounter ridicule. No character is so damaging, even for mere worldly objects, as to be accounted irreligious. Religious motives, religious feelings are daily avowed in Parliament, and instead of exciting ridicule or being denounced as cant, meet with sympathy and confer credit on the speaker. Infidelity itself has ceased to sneer: it has become religious. A contemptuous and mocking unbeliever, a Voltaire or a Diderot, would be banished from all good society. Religious questions engage the attention of all classes. The religious aspect of all our social institutions is examined with the liveliest interest. Religious convictions are followed up with the noblest exhibitions of self-sacrifice. The seductions of a luxurious civilisation are inadequate to suppress the swelling ebullitions of missionary self-denial. Honoured men are seen every day to renounce wealth, rank, influence, and worldly prospects at the bidding of religious persuasion, and they are not sneered at as fools. Churches are burst asunder by the violence of religious commotion; and vast establishments of clergy are driven forth from their pulpits and their homes by the irresistible force of conscience, and confederate in new churches.

In an age like this, amidst such irrepressible impulses of conscience and intellect combined, the anomalies produced in the Liturgy by the circumstances of its origin and the lapse of time were sure to excite awakened attention and uneasiness. The founders of the English Church built her communion upon compromise; many of the reasons which guided them to select such a foundation are unimpaired in strength; but the circumstances which surround the Church are altered. An age of general thoughtfulness and earnestness is adverse to compromise. A common danger compels men to sink subordinate differences for the sake of obtaining common security; when the danger is removed, concessions made under the pressure of alarm lose the motive which prompted them, and in religious matters soon wear the appearance of abandonment of principle. Irritation and internal conflict are speedily engendered; the repulsive forces of the heterogeneous elements combined in

the compromise acquire strength under the heat of religious zeal; and disruption is at hand. Thus it has fared with the Liturgy. Fear of Rome and the critical position of Protestantism, made the best and most earnest men intensely anxious, when the Liturgy was revised at the opening of Elizabeth's reign, to include the largest possible number of persons within the communion of the Church of England. Passages more consonant with Romanist views were introduced into the services; an unfortunate process, pregnant with much mischief; for it founded the comprehensiveness of the Church, not on the common truth acknowledged by all, but on the combination of contradictory elements. Each party thus could sustain itself on passages which positively supported its own views; but then each party also became committed to passages which it positively dissented from; real reconciliation was impossible, and the materials for bitter strife within the Church were handed down to coming generations. These materials the religious earnestness and analytical temper of this age are fanning into flame. A new spirit has broken out amongst the clergy. The Catholic and Protestant principles embodied in the Church's formularies were not formerly pushed to extremity; neither claimed the Church as exclusively their own. Both parties were content to live and let live, never coalescing into intimate union, but neither seeking absolute dominion by the extrusion of the other. Bramhall, Andrews, Hall, and Beveridge, nay, even Laud himself never repudiated Protestantism. It was reserved for our day to penetrate more deeply into the first principles of the conflicting beliefs, till at last the rise of Oxford Tractarianism brought the struggle to a crisis. With wonderful subtlety of thought, and by the help of a most searching analysis, this famous school exhibited in the full blaze of light the radical and irreconcilable antagonism of the fundamental principles of the Protestant and Catholic systems; and as the necessary and reasonable result of this demonstration demanded that the Church of England should no longer halt between two utterly inconsistent opinions, but should emancipate itself into the full freedom of holding one harmonious view of doctrine,—they renounced Protestantism openly and by name; they urged the erasure of every Protestant sentiment which sullied the purity of Catholic doctrine; they preached reconciliation with Rome and the restoration of one Universal Church.

Never at any previous period of the Church of England's history had the incom-

patibility of the elements involved in her constitution been so signally demonstrated; never had such a deliberate, systematic, and powerfully-reasoned attempt been made to carry out one set of principles exclusively through her whole constitution. The ablest and most earnest of the Tractarians struggled with desperate energy and unrivalled resources of talent and knowledge to render Catholicism universally and exclusively triumphant; and, when foiled in the attempt, they evinced the sincerity of their convictions by abandoning the Church whose Protestantism they admitted and disowned. And then the Church sustained, by conversions to Romanism, losses unprecedented in her history. The nation became alarmed; for the number and character of the converts attested the soundness of the logic which could not rest satisfied with the discordant teaching of a Church founded upon compromise. The eyes of all were opened to the really Romanistic nature of the Anglo-Catholicism scattered over the Church's formularies. It was seen that the Liturgy was the weapon with which Tractarianism did battle. The Anglicans extracted passages from the Liturgy which were of Catholic descent, erected these into the standard of doctrine, and required the whole Liturgy to be remodelled upon that standard. Here, plainly, was the root of that teaching which first made men Anglo-Catholics, and then leading them on to Rome, brought trouble and disunion into so many families, and a sense of insecurity upon all. The people were incensed at the treason which their ministers were committing against the Protestant faith; the clergy took shelter behind the Liturgy, pointing to its language as the justification of their tenets. Thus the Liturgy was placed in the van of the battle, a rampart behind which Tractarianism defended itself, an object of assault to Protestant wrath.

Every section of the Liturgy was now keenly scrutinized in the controversy. Each party had to dive below the surface, for it had become a contest of principles; and it was on the principles underlying the language that the battle turned. Protestants—especially the Evangelical section of them—were startled to discover how much of the ancient Catholicism had been retained, and how difficult it was, therefore, to put Tractarians palpably out of court. "The Protestant Church of England" had been their motto; violent was the shock when they were compelled to learn that their Church was not wholly free from the taint of Catholicism. The alarm, which had gone on increasing whilst defections to popery mul-

tiplied, reached its acme when the Papal Bull proclaimed the elation of Rome at the successes it had won, and its confident advance upon England as to an already assured conquest. Public indignation broke out on every side; the most vehement desire was manifested to get rid of the Tractarian treason and of the cover behind which it lay. The warmth of Protestant passion rose higher than reverence for the Liturgy and fear of organic reform. Hosts of enthusiastic laymen announced their resolution to purify the Liturgy and vindicate the genuine Protestantism of the Church of England.

However, this overwhelming display itself of Protestant feeling saved the Liturgy from being again replaced in the crucible. Protestant fears were allayed by the public demonstration of the soundness of the national heart towards the Protestant faith. Rome lowered her arrogance; and the public, content with its victory, shrunk, as was natural in Englishmen, from pressing on radical reforms on the tabooed ground of the Church. But a warning was then given which no Statesman and no Churchman may neglect with impunity. An impression has been made concerning the real character of parts of the Liturgy which is sure to work its way more deeply into the public mind. The causes calculated to produce irritation and danger remain unaltered; they are only less active for a while. Puseyism, far from acknowledging itself defeated on the merits of the controversy, insists on the inconsistency of the various parts of our formularies, and sustains itself as firmly, if not as proudly, as ever. Indeed, in some respects it has won a better position than it held before. The radically Protestant character of the English Church has, it is true, been irrefragably established; but, on the other hand, the cry for a reform of the Liturgy is a virtual admission that some of its elements do not harmonize with the spirit and essence of the Church. This is, so far, solid ground for Puseyism; and so long as it remains to stand upon, so long Tractarianism may vindicate its continuance within the communion of the Church. And if this system of theology shall strike its roots more deeply into the minds of the English clergy, and shall separate them by an ever-widening gulf from the sympathies of the laity,—if it shall continue, as it must and will, to convert the utterances of public prayers into a teaching which is in discord from the general tone of the Church, and shall send forth its disciples in a perpetual stream to Rome,—who can predict the fate

which may await the Liturgy, or even the Church herself, at some future day?

But there are other symptoms besides the uneasiness felt respecting the doctrines contained in some of the services which indicate the growing desire for Liturgical reform. The fetters which cramp the action of the clergy in accommodating their ministrations to the manifold wants of society, excite a longing for greater freedom in minds otherwise little disposed to admit the existence of any imperfection in the institutions of the Church. Already, at Birmingham and elsewhere, the services have been remodelled, by shortening their length and re-arranging their parts; and the *Ruridecanal* Chapter of Leeds, under the presidency of Dr. Hook, has published a report which proposes Liturgical improvements to the utmost extent which can be realized by mere transposing and readjusting. It is obvious that nothing but a strong aversion to apply to Parliament for the necessary authority for effecting changes prevents Dr. Hook and many others from actively bringing forward proposals embracing extensive changes in the machinery of the Church. The desire to carry out such improvements is one of the chief motives that prompt the demand for Synodic action; their need is keenly felt, and the legislative means for effecting them are eagerly sought.

It is not probable that English statesmen will ever consent to the creation of a synod whose authority should rival, and, when firmly established, overrule, that of Parliament. It is certain that in no case will they allow any ecclesiastical body to modify, by its own right, the doctrines professed by the Established Church. On the other hand, the dislike of applying to Parliament for doctrinal reform, and the unwillingness of Parliament to entertain any such proposals, grow stronger every day. The Church is thus left to itself, to take its chance of standing or falling in the form in which it was originally constructed at the Reformation. There is great danger incurred by not repairing the ancient edifice; there is danger likewise in attempting to remould it. And thus, with respect to the Liturgy, the practical and very important question arises, whether the theological views apparently embodied in some of its offices are so dissonant from the prevailing spirit of the Church itself, and so repugnant to the sentiments of most of its members, as to call on Parliament to overcome its aversion to legislate, and to avert the risk of a fatal explosion hereafter by providing a remedy whilst a remedy may still be had.

We will now examine the points against which the strongest objections have been levelled. The first that meets us is the Athanasian Creed. Few reasonable men can now-a-days be found who approve of the damnable clauses, however much they may make an outward show of defending them, as incorporated into the Liturgy, and formally subscribed by the clergy; not one, we are confident, would dream of proposing their adoption, if the Liturgy were now compiled for the first time. Who would not shrink from asserting that a heathen of virtuous life must without doubt perish everlastingly? Still more, who is there that in his heart pronounces endless punishment on the earnest and conscientious man who lives in the faith and love of Christ, but yet is intellectually unable to word his creed in the precise phraseology adopted by the Athanasian formula? It cannot be doubted that these clauses are not really assented to by ministers or congregations; and it is greatly to be lamented that bishops have been so perversely foolish as to insist on the reading of the Creed, instead of leaving it to the discretion of the officiating minister. It is a public scandal, and very injurious to national morality, that such emphatic words should be solemnly used in our churches, and yet accepted by no one; for though each man's conscience may be relieved by the consciousness that the dissent from the natural meaning is so universally understood as to deceive no one, the example of such vehement yet really disavowed assertion is grievously calculated to countenance the low morality which prevails regarding public professions. With respect to the matter itself of the Creed, it is true that the theology of the nineteenth century would not naturally express itself in the language of Hilary of Arles; and that the theory of the incarnation is developed in this Creed to an extent consistent neither with man's real ignorance of this deep mystery, nor with a due reverence for the God-man himself. But, on the other hand, it appears to us that nowhere is the cardinal doctrine of the Trinity expounded with greater felicity and greater power than in the Athanasian Creed. The two fundamental elements of Christian feeling, its two opposite yet correlative poles, are brought out with singular judgment and truth. "The Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God, and yet there are not three Gods, but one God," sums up the whole of our knowledge of this inscrutable mystery, and proclaims those two truths which should influence a Christian's feelings and conduct. Scripture never intended to reveal to us the real and absolute

essence of the divine nature; it could not be grasped by the human understanding. But Scripture has required us to acknowledge, as against Polytheism and Pantheism, the unity of the Godhead, and to realize practically the farther truth, that each of the Divine Persons stands to us in the relation of God—is truly God to us. Towards each we must think, and feel, and act, as God. These are the two practical truths which Scripture reveals, and the Athanasian Creed fully and explicitly declares. Their theoretical and philosophical combination in a single intellectual formula is a problem of which the solution surpasses the power of human reason. To hold them fast *separately* is the Christian's duty; to unite them philosophically neither religion nor reason demands.

The next point objected to is the thanksgiving uttered in the Burial Service, for the removal of the deceased person from the miseries of this world, and the hope that he rests in God. The sincerity of the dead man's faith is thus assumed; yet the Bible and experience alike teach that all professing Christians do not die a Christian's death; and deeply distressing is it often to the feelings of a thoughtful clergyman to be compelled to read this office over the corpse of a notorious sinner. It will be readily granted, that a general statement of the Christian belief in the blessed resurrection of the faithful was all that with propriety could be required in a service applied to every citizen in the land; no specific assertion concerning particular individuals need to have been asserted. Most desirable as would be such an alteration as would limit the language to a declaration of the general truth, it is nevertheless important to observe that in this, as in some other instances which we shall presently notice, there is no fault to be found with the religious doctrine of the service; in the application of it to a particular person alone lies the difficulty. We are aware how many excellent men have been offended by it, and that in not a few cases secession from the Church has been the result. Honestly respecting their motives, and fully conceding the existence of the embarrassment, we nevertheless think that the so-called "charitable hypothesis" might have reasonably allayed their scruples. Not that the expression is well chosen, or represents the matter in its true light. We prefer to say that the Church of England has constructed her services on the supposition that the rite was complete in all its parts, that the necessary qualifications on every side were present, and that, consequently, full scope might be given to the free utterance of the natural feeling con-

needed with each office, unchecked by any reserve founded on the possible failure of any of the requisite conditions. It may be inexpedient—we are of opinion that it is highly so—to apply without restriction the language of Christian privilege to all the members of a Church into which every citizen is baptized, as a matter of course. Still, it is of the utmost moment to observe that this does not amount to an error of *doctrine*. The theology on which the service reposes is not falsified by perplexities of application only; and when the fact of the inapplicability to all cases is so notorious as to serve as a practical commentary on the words, we can readily conceive that a good man may use them under the assurance that no one is practically deceived by them, and that the necessary correction will be supplied by the understanding of the hearers.

We are now come to a class of cases involving considerations of a far more serious nature; cases in which erroneous and unprotestant doctrine is charged with defacing the purity of the Church of England. Three services, those namely for the visitation of the sick, for the ordination of priests and bishops, and for the baptism of infants, are accused of retaining the traces of Catholic theology. On these Anglo-Catholicism takes its stand: here, if anywhere, may Liturgical reform be demanded on the ground of a corruption of the Protestant faith. We own that the service for the visitation of the sick has never appeared to us to present any formidable difficulty. The objection is directed against the absolution. "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences; and by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." The power of the keys, it is alleged, is here ascribed to the officiating minister; and the exclusive and priestly prerogative of Episcopal ordination and the Apostolical succession is implied. We find nothing in this prayer that can warrant such a conclusion. We do not inquire whether it is desirable or not that a sick and penitent sinner should receive from the Church an authoritative assurance of forgiveness. That he is authorized to gather such an assurance from Scripture, provided his repentance and faith be sincere, no one will dispute; and if the Church deems it proper to impart greater support to a soul trembling under a sense of guilt, by a solemn declaration of that pardon whose sole warrant is the Word of God, then we do not see why a Presbyterian or

any other minister may not use this formula as fitly and as naturally as an Episcopal clergyman. In the first place, the prayer for forgiveness distinctly confesses that the absolution comes from God alone: it renders the succeeding confirmation purely ministerial. But in the next, the power of absolving is explicitly asserted to reside in the Church; and this wholly disposes of the objection. The act of the minister is hereby represented as the act of the agent or functionary, to whom the Church has delegated the office of communicating to the sick that assurance of pardon, which it proclaims in the name of Scripture, and which the sick man might himself obtain as effectually and as beneficially from Scripture. The minister indeed announces that he speaks by the authority committed to him by Christ; but this is true of every member of every congregation in every Church. The Church is the depository of all the powers and all the privileges necessary for the continuance and welfare of the Christian society. They emanated from Christ: their exercise is enjoined by his command, and is performed in his name. The appeal to Christ's authority as the warrant for the ministerial function in no way excludes the intervention of the Church. Every preacher who from the pulpit warns, exhorts, and comforts the people, is an ambassador from Christ; he has received a commission from Him thus to speak in the congregation: but that commission came through the Church which appointed him to the ministerial office. Kings and magistrates have from time immemorial proclaimed that they possessed an authority entrusted to them by God; and the claim is just, "for the powers that be are ordained of God." Yet who would build on such language the doctrine that kings held their power directly from God, and irrespectively of the will of the nation—or that no other form of government but monarchy was legitimate—or that a nation did not possess the right of selecting its own form of government? The assertion, therefore, made by the clergyman in the visitation service does not claim any special right or privilege for Episcopal orders; in many respects it falls infinitely below the pretensions advanced for the pastorate by Wesleyan ministers. The officers of that communion would find no difficulty in using this phraseology; and this is a sufficient guarantee that it does not commit any English clergyman to the Anglo-Catholic theory.

The ordination service, on the other hand, is encumbered with a real, though not insuperable difficulty. The imperative mood in the formula of ordination, "Receive thou the Holy Ghost," is objectionable, no doubt,

as being open to misconception, but contains no untruth; for the Word of God authorizes the Church to believe that the special help of the Holy Spirit will be given to every man who with true piety receives any appointment to any office in the Church. If this belief is well founded, and if the Church chooses to frame her services on the presumption that man performing his part, God will also perform His, then the assertion that along with the office the grace needed for its discharge is imparted has nothing that ought to wound a Protestant conscience. Lamentable experience shows that all ministers do not receive the Holy Spirit at ordination; but it equally furnishes ground for confidently holding that many do actually realize the Scriptural doctrine that the ministry of the Christian Church is the ministry of the Holy Ghost. An undoubting prayer for the descent of the Spirit would have created no scruples: the imperative form is but a different expression of the same thing.

On the other hand, the words, "whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained," are not so easy of explanation: for it is hard to say what precise power is here claimed, not for the ministry, but for the Church. That a superstitious sense has been affixed to these words, as if a mysterious power is inherent in the priestly office, is indisputable; but that is a power which the Bible ascribes neither to clergymen nor the Church. The rule for their interpretation must be the meaning in which they admit of being applied to the whole Christian society; for the Apostles alone, according to the Protestant creed, were endowed with powers which were not communicated through and by the Church. If the power of absolving is referred to here—and this is the most probable supposition—we have already seen that this power in the strongest form in which it appears in the Liturgy, is expressly declared to have been "left to the Church;" and when conveyed to the minister by ordination, according to the interpretation supplied by the service itself for the visitation of the sick, becomes an authority delegated by the Church to pronounce in the name of Christ an assurance of forgiveness or to withhold it, according as the disposition of mind required for the receiving of pardon is present or not in the sinner. No intelligent Protestant can wish to see this formula retained; but even here we may fearlessly maintain that no anti-Protestant doctrine is asserted.

We are now brought to the last and most important topic of our inquiry: the service for infant baptism. This is the great battlefield between Tractarians and Evangeli-

cals, High-Churchmen and Low-Churchmen, Catholics and Protestants, within the Church of England. In the view taken of the nature and effects of infant baptism, the vital distinction between Protestantism and every form of so-called Catholic principles is brought to light. To this service Anglo-Catholicism appeals as a distinct recognition of the sacerdotal doctrine. "It is the especial province of Christian laymen at this time," says the author of the pamphlet whose title we have prefixed to this Article, "to protest against that noxious principle of sacerdotal assumption which has been the fruitful source of every superstitious perversion of gospel truth. It is a fundamental error, and a root of almost inexhaustible fertility." Most true is the remark. This is the melancholy moral furnished by ecclesiastical history from the second century down to the nineteenth. This is the fatal poison imbibed from the combined influences of Judaism and heathenism, which has contaminated the pure stream of the Christian faith, and, preying on its vitals, has rendered it comparatively powerless to realize those glorious hopes which its bright dawn ushered into the world. This has been the prolific seed of almost every corruption: the dark and brooding cloud which has obscured the brilliant ideal of Christian truth, which has debased the standard of its purity: and by the interposition between God and the Christian of a mediator as helpless and as sinful as himself, has striven to obliterate the grand characteristic of his faith—his belief in a personal union with Him who is both God and man. This corruption strikes its roots into the lowest depths of human nature: and most hard is it to eradicate.

Sacerdotalism, unable to derive the smallest support from the Christian Scriptures, invented the sacramental theory as a basis on which to sustain itself. In the absence of all authority from revelation it was felt that the doctrine of a priesthood would be more easily accepted, if functions could be devised which appeared to call for the creation of an order of priests. Priests were not needed for the purely ministerial functions of presiding over public worship and ruling the Christian people. But if men's souls were to be saved by the eating of bread and wine, converted by human operation into the very body and blood of the Lord, and their sins were to be washed away by the sprinkling of water, what could be more natural than that such an awful power over human destiny should be entrusted to a peculiar and separate order of officers? It was no longer in the depths of the human spirit that the feelings, affections,

and character of man were to be renewed and purified: they were to be reached through the body. An external agency was now needed; and since on that external agency, by a mysterious law, the state of the soul depended, it seemed to require a special class of men commissioned to wield its mighty influence. The two parts of the theory exactly fitted together: the soul to be acted on through the body, and priests to administer this action.

"Sacramental grace," says Mr. Dodsworth, "is the very life and soul of the Church system." Does the Church of England profess this priestly theory of sacramental grace? If she does so anywhere, it is confessedly in the baptismal service. It is not to be denied that the High-Churchmen have the natural sense of the words in their favour. They have not been slow to press it, to the great discomfort of Evangelicals: and so unhappy did many of these feel, that either a secession or a successful pressure on Parliament to alter the expressions in the Liturgy might have been the result, had not the Bishop of Exeter, in an evil hour for himself and his friends, resolved to bring the dispute to a crisis, knowing that "the dogmatic theory of baptism becomes of necessity the basis of the entire scheme of Anglican theology." With a full sense, therefore, of the magnitude of the question, he sought to commit the Church exclusively to this particular doctrine of sacramental grace, by means of a judicial decree on the phraseology of the baptismal formularies as they now stand. He appealed to the Church for an interpretation of her own language; but instead of obtaining from her an exclusive recognition of the sacerdotal system, he established the party he assailed in a legality which up to that moment they had not previously enjoyed. He singled out for condemnation an emphatic denier of the necessary connexion between the outward ordinance and the spiritual grace, and expected with confidence, what many on the opposite side equally expected with trembling, an authoritative affirmation of "the catholic doctrine of baptism." But the bishop found to his cost that the uncertainties of ecclesiastical litigation are as disappointing as those of secular. The Church refused to put an exclusive interpretation on her formularies; she justified, as an unoffending Churchman, the minister whose theory severed the rite from the inward virtue, and formally relieved Low-Churchmen from the difficulty of the baptismal language. The legal position of the Evangelicals was established. Henceforward no one could charge them with rejecting an opinion to which the

law had required them to give their solemn assent and consent.

We have said, "the Church" advisedly. Great was the wailing, and loud the protest, that the Judicial Committee was not the Church: but all to no purpose. The Judicial Committee is by the law of the Church of England her Supreme Court, the voice by which alone she interprets, the final tribunal by which she judges heresy and every other spiritual cause. It is idle to talk of the modern origin of the Committee. The Supremacy had conferred on the Crown full jurisdiction over all spiritual causes and persons in the Court of Delegates. The Crown might have selected under that right the very members of the Judicial Committee to try Mr. Gorham: and the same authority which had established the Court of Delegates had substituted the Committee in its room. To deny the competency of the Judicial Committee to be the voice of the Church of England, is simply to deny the law and constitution of that Church; and is as absurd as it would be to repudiate the jurisdiction of the Queen's Bench upon the ground of some theory which would prefer a different tribunal. The ecclesiastical legitimacy of the Committee was triumphantly vindicated by Mr. Wilberforce and others, who seceded upon the principle that the highest Court of the Church of England was an institution not consistent with Catholic doctrine. They admitted, whilst they dissented from, the constitution of the English Church.

But now that the Church has sanctioned the legal title of the deniers of baptismal regeneration to be members of her communion, the further and very important question arises, whether it is right or expedient to retain the language of the baptismal office unchanged? It is impossible to evade this inquiry. The Court did not affix its own sense on the language of the service: it simply declared that there was nothing in that language to compel it to expel from the communion of the Church those who expressly, and in terms, rejected baptismal regeneration. It virtually recognised that the authoritative documents of the Church of England do not admit, according to the natural meaning of words, of one harmonious interpretation: and thereupon wisely judged that any opinion sanctioned by the language of one of those documents might be lawfully held, however much it might be contradicted by that of another. It made the Church of England comprehensive of all the doctrines contained in all its formularies. Now, right and necessary as this decision may have been, the embarrassments which flow from it are great and manifest. The

irreconcilable conflict between the separate parts of that whole to which every clergyman is required to pledge his unfeigned assent, is officially admitted by the principle on which the decision proceeded: how, then, can the terms in which subscription is demanded at ordination be any longer justified? What can be more cruel towards tender consciences, and more injurious to good faith, than to insist on a declaration of consent to each single one of a collection of theological opinions, which even the Church herself does not pretend to reconcile together? Then, again, it is clear that the highest tribunal of the Church has given evangelical clergymen no relief in the use of the baptismal service. All that it has done in pronouncing them to be the true sons of the Church, has been either to authorize them to attach a non-natural sense to the term "regeneration," or to give them liberty to dissent from the doctrine involved in prayers which they address to the Almighty. Either solution of the difficulty has been felt to be most unsatisfactory and distressing.

The oft-disputed question, therefore, forcibly recurs, What is the doctrine contained in the baptismal service? "The only plea," says our author, "set up in defence of its language by those who persist in vindicating it, notwithstanding the admission that their own view would, even in theory, and apart from the experience of the result, be averse to the use of such language, is the charitable hypothesis." This plea, though elaborately defended by the evangelical Mr. Goode, our author, who apparently is an evangelical himself, proceeds to combat with great energy. We agree with him in holding, that this plea will not successfully defend the language; but we think also, that he has not done justice to Mr. Goode's argument, or pointed out the real objection to it with sufficient force. If baptism were to be administered at confirmation, when the candidate makes a voluntary and public confession of the Christian faith in the presence of God and the Church, Mr. Goode would be perfectly justified in availing himself of the charitable hypothesis, and there would be no reason why the baptized person should not be spoken of as a regenerated man and as a member of Christ. Indeed, our author virtually establishes the charitable hypothesis, when he quotes the Apostle Paul as calling those brethren who yet were guilty of the grossest sins. In fact, St. Paul's language is still stronger: he tells the Corinthians that they "come behind in no gift." Would it be possible to carry the charitable hypothesis farther? But, in truth, the capital, the fatal objection to the present baptis-

mal service of the Church of England, is, that in no case of unconscious infants can we reasonably suppose that the spiritual grace therein implied has been obtained through the spiritual qualification of the recipient. If a spiritual effect has been produced on the soul of the infant, it must have been produced wholly, *on man's side*, by the agency of the priest: his outward act has altered the mind of the baptized person without any consciousness of his own. This is a superstition which contradicts directly the very idea of Christianity; but it is also the essence of sacerdotalism. It is indisputable, that if the term "regeneration" expresses any spiritual effect on the soul, the baptismal service countenances the sacramental system and the priestly theory. And precisely the same result follows also, if (as some High Churchmen, who hesitated to ascribe to the sprinkling of the baptismal water a transforming power on the soul, have imagined) the effect of baptism is limited to the washing away of original sin. This supposition implies that an infant, who had the misfortune of dying before baptism, necessarily retains the burden of original guilt, and, as Augustine and many others have believed, falls under eternal condemnation. How any person who had obtained the faintest insight into the meaning of the Christian religion could have brought himself to believe that God consigns an unconscious and helpless being to eternal happiness or eternal misery, according as an external and purely mechanical operation has been performed upon him by the instrumentality of others, is what we have never been able to conceive. But certainly, if life or death, and that for ever, depends upon an outward rite, without the slightest mental concurrence on the part of the recipient, the fundamental idea of a priesthood, the intervention of a human mediator between God and man, is established: sacerdotalism has gained its principle: it will have an easy victory over every other impediment.

But, thank God, there is not one word in the New Testament which in the slightest degree sanctions so terrible a doctrine: we are spared the pain, to say the least, of seeing the Christian Scriptures contradicting their own ideal of Christianity. The origin of the mischief is plain. The doctrine of the baptismal service is true: the unconsciousness of the infant is the real *fons mali*. The baptismal service is founded on Scripture; but its application to an unconscious infant is destitute of any express Scriptural warrant. Scripture knows nothing of the baptism of infants. There is absolutely not a single trace of it to be found in the New

Testament. There are passages which may be reconciled with it, if the practice can only be proved to have existed; but there is not one word which asserts its existence. Nay more, it may be urged that 1 Cor. vii. 14, is incompatible with the supposition that infant baptism was then practiced at Corinth. The Apostle in this passage seeks to remove the scruples of those Christian partners in mixed marriages, who believed that a conjugal union with a heathen was a state profane and unholy in God's sight. He reassures them by an argument founded on a *reductio ad absurdum*. You admit, says he, that your children are holy; then be persuaded that the marriage from which that sanctity was derived is holy also. For, were it otherwise; if, as you imagine, the marriage is unholy, then it would follow that the children that are the fruits of it would be unclean and unholy also; whereas you know and admit the reverse; you confess them to be holy. It is absolutely indispensable for the validity of this argument, that the sanctity of the children should have been *exclusively* derived from the sanctity of the marriage; for on no other hypothesis could the sanctity of the children have furnished a proof of the sanctity of the marriage. Had the children been baptized, they would have been holy in their own right, as members of Christ; and a father, who had had his children baptized, would have effectually demolished the Apostle's reasoning by the simple reply, that the holiness of his children, as members of Christ's Church, was no reason for his thinking the marriage holy, or his not putting away his unbelieving wife. Many, indeed, have explained the term holy as meaning, "have been admitted to baptism," making the verse say, that if the faith of the believing partner had not sanctified the marriage, the children would not have been admitted to baptism, whereas they had been baptized. But this is to re-write Scripture, not to interpret it.

History confirms the inference drawn from the sacred volume. Infant baptism cannot be clearly traced higher than the middle of the second century; and even then it was not universal. Some, indeed, have argued that in the silence of Scripture it is fair to presume that a custom whose existence is seen in the second century must have descended from the Apostles: but the presumption is wholly the other way. Baptism appears in the New Testament avowedly as the rite whereby *converts* were incorporated into the Christian society: the burden of the proof is entirely on those who affirm its applicability to those whose minds

are incapable of any conscious act of faith. The example of circumcision is appealed to as justifying the practice. We do not doubt that this example had, as it deserved, immense influence in causing the extension of baptism to infants; and we are quite willing to accept it as an authority for the institution, provided that the two rites are placed upon the same level. The authority is valid, provided it is not pressed beyond the identity of the analogy. Circumcision dedicated the child to God, brought him under covenant with God, and was a sign and pledge that he should receive, from time to time, such blessings as were suited to his capacity and circumstances. Infant baptism may be and is a repetition of all these things. But no one ever asserted that circumcision renewed a child's mind at eight days old; nor that its omission would have made him liable to eternal perdition. Circumcision, therefore, is a warrant only for an external, though holy, relation being established towards God by infant baptism. The truth, then, is clear. The language of Scripture regarding baptism implies the spiritual act of faith in the recipients. When infant baptism is now spoken of, the necessary modification must accordingly be made in applying *language used by Scripture concerning Spiritual baptism only*. Inextricable confusion has been the inevitable consequence when language used of adults, of persons possessed of intelligence, and capable of spiritual acts, was gratuitously applied to unconscious infants; and it cannot be a matter for wonder, that a totally new conception of the ordinance should have been created by such a perversion. So great was the difficulty felt to be by Luther, who retained infant baptism, and assumed that the language used of baptism in Scripture applied to the baptized infant, that in order to fence out priestly superstition, he imagined that God, who bestowed regeneration, bestowed also, by a direct miraculous act, that intelligent faith which the spiritual nature of Christianity demanded. Our age is not likely to acquiesce in such a solution; but it bears witness to the just perception which Luther had of the impossibility of applying to infants, without a modification somewhere, the Scriptural language regarding baptism.

The non-recognition of the fact that the external rite of infant baptism is not the baptism spoken of in Scripture is the source of the palpable weakness of English Low-Churchmen in the discussion of this question. They have reason and religion on their side; but in the appeal to Scripture, they are undeniably worsted by their oppo-

nents. No shift will ever help them. The advantage possessed by the High-Church party rests on the assumption that what is said of baptism in Scripture may be equally said of the infant baptism practised by the Church of England; and nothing but a denial of their complete identity will or can strip them of this advantage. Evangelicals are afraid of looking at the truth in the face. They are hampered by a superstitious feeling about infant baptism: they are afraid of discrediting it, in spite of the many excellent reasons which justify its adoption; and they are still more afraid of saying that the baptism of the Church of England is not identical with the Spiritual baptism of the Apostles. So long as they refuse to admit the real truth, so long must they be content to carry on this all-important controversy at a fearful disadvantage; and so long must they continue to experience the bitter consequences of the fact, "that here the spirit of Popery, under one or other of its more specious forms, has for the last three centuries retained a footing within the very stronghold of Protestantism, from which it has never yet been dislodged."

But a brighter day is dawning. Dr. McNeile, Mr. Litton, we may almost add, the Archbishop of Canterbury, are perceiving that the practice of infant baptism is not found in Scripture. When the fact is universally recognised the controversy will assume a new form. The ground will be completely cut away from beneath the sacramental theory; and Protestants will have the full benefit of their own principle—the appeal to Scripture as the form of religious truth. Whilst this historical conversion is in progress, greatly as we deplore the evils which flow from the baptismal service, we regard any attempt to introduce a change as premature.

But let us not be misunderstood: we have not wished to breathe the slightest insinuation against the legitimacy and the importance of infant baptism. We have expressed our persuasion, that it is a rite unknown to Scripture, and that it was probably unpractised in the apostolic age; but we also firmly believe that it is an institution eminently conformable to the genuine spirit of Christianity, as such warranted by Scripture, and in the highest degree valuable to the Christian Church. Scripture furnishes the strongest warrants for believing that the infant children of Christian parents are placed in a peculiar and holy relation towards God. The precedent of circumcision, of itself alone, furnishes ample authority for the dedication of Christian infants to God, and their public incorporation into the Church of Christ. The emphatic blessing pronounced

by the Lord Himself on little children—His tender and loving command to bring them to him—has found an echo in every Christian heart; it has been rightly felt to confer the highest of all possible sanctions on the practice of infant baptism by the Christian Church. Who can estimate the unspeakable importance of the fact, that the soul at the earliest dawn of intelligence should awaken to the consciousness of its consecration to Christ—that it should learn at the same time that it is a religious and a Christian being? What Christian parent does not desire for his child that his opening mind should catch the feeling that he belongs to Christ—that Christ loves him and has redeemed him—and that he is, by a solemn act of consecration, Christ's child? But in the absence of all express institution of infant baptism by Christ or His Apostles, we dare not call it a complete sacrament till the consciousness of the baptized person has become capable of fulfilling the spiritual condition of the sacramental blessing, and become susceptible of its reception. The celebration of the outward rite at an age when intelligence is still dormant separates, in respect of time, the two elements which are necessary to constitute a sacrament: and we have not a particle of authority for supposing that the sacramental virtue can be realized till both elements are present. A spiritual blessing of necessity implies a spiritual recipient. This momentous truth—which lies at the foundation of the Christian faith—has been forgotten by those who hold that infant baptism is a complete sacrament. They have been betrayed into this forgetfulness by the belief that infant baptism was expressly of apostolic origin, and by the consequent pressure of the language of Scripture. They found spiritual blessings attached to baptism in Scripture; but they found also spiritual conditions imposed upon the recipient. The belief that infant baptism was the institution then spoken of involved them in a hopeless dilemma, from which they vainly endeavoured to extricate themselves by overlooking the spiritual state of the infant, and at the same time supposing that God, in some mysterious manner, communicated some equally mysterious blessing to his soul. The very essence of sacerdotalism was involved in this belief. But a mere examination of Scripture has made all clear. The language of the apostolic Church does not apply to infant baptism, and is consequently free from every taint of the priestly theory. The Church indeed advanced, and as we most honestly believe, rightly advanced, in the very spirit of Scripture principles already indicated, to the baptism of infants;

but it neglected, whilst modifying the practice, to modify the rule which guided the interpretation of Scripture respecting it. The defect can be supplied now. The Church can and does uphold infant baptism as a truly Christian and most precious institution; but it ought not to speak of it as a full sacrament, until the understanding of the baptized has consciously accepted the Christian faith and ratified the baptismal covenant. Then, and not till then, may the words of Scripture regarding baptism be applied; for then only will the sacrament be such as Scripture in these words supposes it to be.

We are anxious to draw from what precedes the moral of the vast importance of a sound exegesis. Those whose motto and watchword is Scripture should above all others be accurate and scientific in the interpretation of Scripture. Religious controversies are every day assuming more and more the sharp and definite form of an antagonistic struggle between the Christianity of Scripture and the Christianity of tradition. The Word of God is the touchstone by which alone we can distinguish truth from error in tradition—the right interpretation of that Word is the only weapon with which it is possible for Protestants to win the victory. The neglect of a scientific exegesis is, we grieve to say, the glaring defect of modern English Low-Churchmen—the fruitful source of many defeats. A lamentable distrust of the application of the laws of philosophy and historical criticism to the Bible is the result—war is declared against the progress of the intellect—and powerful adversaries are arrayed against the cause of religion and Scripture. The Bible is capable of vindicating God's truth against all foes; but for this the Bible must be made to utter its own real meaning. The history of the Church throughout numerous ages shews how Scripture may be overridden and set at naught by the traditions of men: it is a two-edged sword, but God has not willed it to be victorious, except for those who know how to use it rightly. Piety is an indispensable qualification in the Christian interpreter; but piety alone will not enable him to discharge his office. Piety has too frequently been associated with ignorant dogmatism and shallow presumption. At no age of the Christian Church has a profound and accurate exposition of Scripture been more urgently needed than in the present day; and we emphatically warn those to whom the Protestant faith is dear, that if they wish to resist successfully the assaults of Popery of every form, and infidelity, they must take their stand on the right interpretation of Scripture.

- ART. IV.—1. *Poems, Lyrical and Dramatic.* By HENRY WADSWORTH LONGFELLOW; with an Introductory Essay, by GEORGE GILFILLAN. Liverpool, 1848.
2. *Poems.* By THOMAS BUCHANAN READ. Illustrated by KENNY MEADOWS. 12mo. London, 1852.
3. *Poems.* By EDGAR ALLAN POE. Edited, with an Essay on his Life and Genius, by JAMES HANNAY. 8vo. London, 1852.
4. *The Poetical Works of WILLIAM CULLEN BRYANT.* 3 vols. London, 1850.

It is the unhappy error of nearly all recent criticism of art—of poetry especially—that its judgments have been formed without reference to any high or very distinct standard of what it is desirable and right that poetry should be. A poem is praised because it is well finished, or because it has been dashed off in a masterly way, or because it is “original,” “pathetic,” or “lyrical,” or “well constructed;” or on account of some other properly secondary quality, quite compatible with general worthlessness or positive demerit. We cannot help thinking that a sounder tone of criticism would produce, indirectly, a sounder tone of art than that which at present prevails. It is certain that no artist,—poet or otherwise,—will ever be made or marred by reading good criticism; but it is equally certain that the weeds which flourish under the encouragement of a lax critical system, do discourage and tend to choke the flower of true art; and that these might, in a great measure, be uprooted and done away with, if we would ascertain and ruthlessly declare their worthless and noxious character.

In the art and criticism of America we generally behold the errors of our own art and criticism exaggerated. Happily for the hopes of the world, America has a filial—almost more than filial—affection and reverence for Britain and the “Britishers.” But this attachment is not without its disadvantages: affection and reverence beget imitation; and the imitator is always more or less blind, and most often, is found to copy the deformities of his model first. In commenting upon the shortcomings of American poetry and criticism of poetry, let us adopt a tone of self-reproval; for, if we have taught errors by our example, we should set the example of repentance. In endeavouring, therefore, to heighten, as far as we can, the common estimate of what poetry ought to be, and in pronouncing American poetry, generally, to be an example of what poetry ought not to be, we would have it understood that we have no intention of implying

a favourable contrast upon the side of our own modern writers.

We have placed at the head of this Article the names of the four poets who seem to us to be the most notable, as yet, produced by America. Two of them, Bryant and Longfellow, have won a considerable reputation on this side of the Atlantic; the other two, Read and Poe, are not so well known here, although, to our thinking, they are quite as well worth knowing as the others are.

We regret that we cannot fully join in the popular applause of Mr. Longfellow's poems. In what we are about to say of them, it must be understood that we dwell more upon the faults of these poems than we should have done were it not that their merits have already enjoyed more than a fair share of public attention.

In criticizing Mr. Longfellow, we have a part to play that requires some boldness,—we must speak ill of his model, Goethe, who, by a most strange injustice, has of late been permitted to usurp a throne in the seventh heaven of fame, with Shakespeare, Dante, and Homer.

Goethe was probably the greatest critic that ever lived; but we are convinced that the next generation will be astonished at the admiration with which his poetry has come to be regarded by us. In our opinion, Goethe's poetry is always more or less *heartless*. His minor poems are full of warm fancy, exquisitely expressed; but there is more heart in half a dozen of Burns's songs than in all Goethe's minor poems put together. Faust, we venture to think, is immensely overrated. Everybody praises it, and calls it profound, because there is much of it that nobody understands, or was intended to understand. It abounds with deep lines and picturesque passages, but it has no claim to be regarded as the great symbolical poem which it pretends to be. This is proved by what we know of its history. Large portions are unmodified transcriptions of literal stories: the track of light that follows the wake of the black dog turns out to be an optical fact which had been observed by Goethe. Other incidents are anecdotes of the poet's youth; and in the "Intermezzo" there are numerous allusions of a personal and temporary character, *confessedly to be understood only by those who were in the secrets of a narrow literary coterie*. Goethe felt this, but had not the boldness to undeceive his numerous admirers. At an early stage of the composition of "Faust," he saw the prudence of postponing the discovery of its essential defects by allowing it always to remain as a fragment. Of the wickedness and vulgarity for which Cole-

ridge has condemned this poem, we do not speak, for Mr. Longfellow has not so much imitated these, its worst qualities, as its lighter sins of false pretension and charlatanism.

"Hermann and Dorothea" is a charming work, full of profound and simple wisdom, and of clear and sweet descriptive power; but in reading it we are somehow made to think much more of the skilful author than of the hero and heroine. The warmth is always of the fancy, never of the heart.

Judging from Mr. Longfellow's works, "The Golden Legend," "Evangeline," and his miscellaneous verses, we feel pretty well convinced that his ideal of a great poet is Goethe, and that the poems of Goethe that we have named are his favourite models. If so, he has perfectly succeeded in copying many of their faults, though he has seldom attained to their merits of admirable finish and most delicate sensual perception.

We have space to notice, in detail, only a few minor pieces of Mr. Longfellow's, together with his best known poem, "Evangeline," which would certainly have been a notable work had "Hermann and Dorothea" never been written.

"Evangeline" is evidently an ambitious work, and its great popularity has perhaps persuaded Mr. Longfellow that he has succeeded in his attempt to write a great poem. We have, however, to bring against it a few complaints which will probably smite Mr. Longfellow's artistical conscience with a sense of their truth; for we have much respect for this gentleman's understanding, although we decidedly dissent from the public voice, which would place him, we sincerely believe, against his own cool estimate of himself, in the rank of the great abiding poets. As "Evangeline" is commonly, perhaps justly, regarded as being, on the whole, the most notable work in verse hitherto produced by an American, we shall make a somewhat detailed inquiry into its merits and demerits. The subject is decidedly a fine one, and was probably fixed upon by Mr. Longfellow in consequence of the outcry which had been raised by critics in England and America for a poem that should be truly American in subject and scenery. The historical foundations of the poem are these facts:—In 1713, before Great Britain had established her great colonial empire in North America, Acadia, the province now called Nova Scotia, was ceded to her by France. The inhabitants, who seem to have been little studied throughout the whole transaction, were soon induced to swear allegiance to their new masters, upon the sole condition that they should be ex-

empt from bearing arms against the French or Indians, in defence of the province; the former being, as it were, their countrymen, and the latter connected with them by alliances and by the private bonds of friendship. The English Government objected to this condition, but though some alteration was intended to be made no new oath was administered, and the old oath, therefore, remained valid. Before the termination of the "war of succession," when Acadia was annexed to the British settlements, and the English extended their possessions in that quarter by the capture of Fort Beau Séjour, the Acadians were accused of having forfeited their neutrality by supplying intelligence, provisions, and quarters, to the French and Indians at Beau Séjour. It is by no means certain how far this charge was just. It was, however, followed by a severe chastisement upon the simple-minded Acadians. The punishment was delayed, and any announcement of its nature avoided, till the harvests were gathered in, that the British army might seize on the grain. The villagers were then called, on a particular day, into the church of Grand Pré, to hear the orders of their new governor, the king of England. It was then announced that all the lands, tenements, herds, grain, and other effects, except money and household goods, of the people, were forfeited to the crown, and themselves to be removed to distant colonies. This precaution of distributing the Acadians among English settlers was taken to prevent the possibility of their joining with the French against their new masters, whom they had now so little cause to love. Ships and soldiers were on the spot to execute this abominable decree. The whole number of persons collected together at Grand Pré on this occasion was somewhat under two thousand, and these were hurried on shipboard with the most cruel confusion, and disastrous and life-long separations of child from parent, husband from wife, and

lover from lover. A disaster of the last kind furnishes the story. Evangeline is about to be married to Gabriel Lajeunesse. In the hurry of deportation they are separated by hundreds of miles, and have no means of discovering each other's destination. Gabriel takes to the wandering life of a huntsman in prairie and mountain. Evangeline lives on, moving, according to opportunity, from one place to another, in the hope of finding him. At one moment he passes her on the river, but she is sleeping, and does not hear of his having done so till it is too late to overtake him. She does, however, follow him, and is on his track for months and years. Finally, she gives up the search in despair; and in the last scene we find her an old woman, tending the sick in an hospital, to which an old man, Gabriel, is brought to die. They recognise each other, and he expires in trying to pronounce her name.

"Evangeline" is written in hexameters, or at least in lines that are intended to pass for hexameters, for real hexameters are next to impossible in a language like ours, which owes nearly all its capacity for versification to *accent*, and not to quantity; while, however, true hexameters are almost impossible in English, pseudo-hexameters, like those of Mr. Clough and Mr. Longfellow, are so easy that they entirely miss the great end of metre, namely, that of imposing a severe external law upon the otherwise rank exuberance of poetical feeling and expression. Such hexameters are, indeed, nothing more than the revival of the "measured prose" which was thought so much of in the days of our grandmothers, and which chiefly consisted in the recurrence, at intervals, of from fourteen to eighteen syllables, of the monotonous cadence that alone distinguishes Mr. Longfellow's verses from ordinary prose.

We commence our extracts from "Evangeline" with the description of the heroine.

"Fair was she to behold, that maiden of seventeen summers.
 Black were her eyes as the berry that grows on the thorn by the way side;
 Black, yet how softly they gleamed beneath the brown shade of her tresses!
 Sweet was her breath as the breath of kine that feed in the meadows.
 When in the harvest heat, she bore to the reapers, at noontide,
 Flagons of home-brewed ale; ah! fair, in sooth, was the maiden.
 Fairer was she on Sunday morn, while the bell from its turret
 Sprinkled with holy sounds the air, as the priest with his hyssop
 Sprinkles the congregation, and scatters blessings upon them;
 Down the long street she passed, with her chaplet of beads and her missal,
 Wearing her Norman cap, and her kirtle of blue, and her ear-rings,
 Brought in the olden time from France, and since, as an heir-loom,
 Handed down from mother to child, through long generations.
 But a celestial brightness, a more ethereal beauty,
 Shone on her face, and encircled her form, when after confession,
 Homeward serenely she walked, with God's benediction upon her.
 When she had past, it seemed liked the ceasing of exquisite music."

This damsel had of course many wooers, but

"Among all who came, young Gabriel only was welcome :
Gabriel Lajeunesse, the son of Basil the blacksmith,
Who was a mighty man in the village, and honoured of all men ;
For since the birth of time, throughout all ages and nations,
Has the craft of the smith been held in repute by the people.
Basil was Benedict's friend. Their children, from earliest childhood,
Grew up together as brother and sister ; and Father Felician,
Priest and pedagogue both in the village, had taught them their letters
Out of the selfsame book, with the hymns of the Church and the plain song.
But when the hymn was sung, and the daily lesson completed,
Swiftly they hurried away to the forge of Basil the blacksmith.
There, at the door, they stood with wandering eyes, to behold him
Take in his leathern lap the hoof of the horse as a plaything,
Nailing the shoe in its place ; while near him the tire of the cart-wheel
Lay like a fiery snake, curled round in a circle of cinders.
't ft in Autumnal eves, when without in the gathering darkness,
Bursting with light seemed the smithy, through every cranny and crevice.
Warm by the forge within, they watched the labouring bellows,
And as its panting ceased, and the sparks expired in the ashes,
Merrily laughed, and said they were nuns going into the chapel."

The evening of the lover's formal betrothal is ushered in by some extremely pleasing description,—

"Day with its burden and heat had departed, and twilight descending,
Brought back the evening star to the sky, and the herds to the homestead :
Pawing the ground they came, and resting their necks on each other,
And with their nostrils distended, inhaling the freshness of evening.
Foremost, bearing the bell, Evangeline's beautiful heifer,
Proud of her snow-white hide, and the ribbon that waved from her collar,
Quietly paced, and slow, as if conscious of human affection.
Then came the shepherd back with his bleating flocks from the sea-side,
Where was their favourite pasture. Behind them followed the watch-dog,
Patient, full of importance, and grand in the pride of his instinct,
Walking from side to side with a lordly air, and superbly
Waving his bushy tail, and urging forward the stragglers."

The scenery of village, forest, and prairie, are given with breadth and distinctness enough to please, though with none of that *more than scientific* accuracy of observation and description which is characteristic of the great poet. The author is profuse in illustrations, which, although they are often striking, are seldom harmonious, or in keeping with the feeling of the passage into which they are introduced. The following lines afford one out of scores of examples which we could bring forward to prove the fault in question :—

"In doors, warm by the wide-mouth'd fire-place, idly the farmer
Sat in his elbow-chair, and watched how the flame and the smoke wreaths
Struggled together, like foes in a burning city. Behind him,
Nodding and mocking along the wall, with gestures fantastic,
Darted his own huge shadow, and vanished away into darkness.
Faces clumsily carved in oak, on the back of his arm-chair,
Laughed in the flickering light ; and the pewter plates on the dresser
Caught and reflected the flame, as shields of armies the sunshine !"

Here is a piece of singularly good description quite ruined, as far as regards unity of feeling, by the last half-line. What in the world have "shields of armies" to do with a farmer's cosy kitchen in Acadia? a place which probably never saw a soldier till the day upon which a small detachment arrived to put an end to the quiet little common-wealth which had established itself there. Mr. Longfellow seems to think that an illustration from the Bible will make up in sacredness for any degree of inaptitude. The following are a few instances of this mistake. Evangeline was looking at the evening sky,—

"And as she gazed from the window, she saw serenely the moon pass
Forth from the folds of a cloud, and one star followed her footsteps,
As out of Abraham's tent young Ishmael wandered with Hagar !"

Again, when Evangeline, on learning that her lover passed her on the river while she was sleeping, sets out with the blacksmith in pursuit of him; the "priest," by way, we suppose, of keeping up his sacerdotal character, bids Basil farewell, exclaiming,—

"See that you bring back the prodigal son from his fasting and famine,
And, too, the foolish virgin, who slept when the bridegroom was coming."

Now there is nothing whatever in Gabriel's behaviour or position to assimilate him to "the prodigal son;" and the inaptness of the allusion in the second line is only surpassed by its irreverence. At another time the villagers were assembled on the beach, waiting for the embarkation of themselves and their goods; and among them wandered the faithful priest, consoling, and blessing, and cheering,

"Like unto shipwrecked Paul on Melita's desolate sea-strand."

But not more like unto Paul on that occasion than any other religious person, walking in another place, on any other sea-coast, and under any cir-

"with the winds of September
Wrestled the trees of the forest, as Jacob of old with the angel."

Our last example of this painfully mistaken kind of illustration is from the death-bed of Gabriel,—

"Hot and red on his lips still burned the flush of the fever,
As if life, like the Hebrew, with blood had besprinkled the portals,
That the angel of death might see the sign, and pass over."

This, if it can be called an illustration at all, is an illustration "by contraries," seeing that, in this instance, the angel of death did *not* pass over, and that the flushed lips were a sign rather of Gabriel's being a fit victim for the destroyer, than one who was free from his power. Another effect of Mr. Longfellow's want of true poetical sincerity is seen in a class of similies which, by the conspicuous position given to them, are evidently favourites with him, but which seem to us to be conceits often of scarcely a first-rate album rank. The stars, for example, are called "the forget-me-nots of the angels."

Mr. Longfellow, we believe, makes no secret of his being a Socinian; but we should have guessed him to be such from the air of unreality about all the portions of "Evangeline" in which the life and doctrines of Christianity are brought in for artistical effect. The inhabitants of Grand Pré are a great deal too good. They "lack gall to make oppression bitter," and are robbed of their most sacred rights, for which they were bound, as good Christians, to fight to the death, as easily as a flock of sheep are brought to the slaughter. There are occasions when Christians, *as members of a community*, are bound to do their very best towards confounding and slaying their fellow-creatures by whom they are attacked. Such an occasion was that which is represented by Mr. Longfellow as having happened to the inhabitants of Acadia. Let any Christian, English, Scottish, or Irish, fancy that the news had reached him one fine morning, that a French army had taken steps towards "deporting" him and his from their rightful soil, and assuming possession of his property—wife and daughters perhaps included: would his wrath be calmed, and his resistance stopped by such words as Father Felician's address to the simple Acadians?

"In the midst of the tumult and strife of angry contention,
Lo! the door of the chancel opened, and Father Felician,
Entered with serious mien, and ascended the steps of the altar.
Raising his reverend hand, with a gesture, he awed into silence
All that clamorous throng; and thus he spake to his people;
Deep were his tones, and solemn; in accents measured and mournful
Spake he, as after the tocsin's alarum, distinctly the clock strikes.
'What is this that ye do, my children? what madness has seized you?
Forty years of my life have I laboured among you and taught you,
Not in the word alone, but in deed, to love one another!
Is this the fruit of my toils, of my vigils, and prayers, and privations?
Have you so soon forgotten all lessons of love and forgiveness!
This is the house of the Prince of Peace, and would you profane it

Thus with violent deeds, and words overflowing with hatred ?
 Lo ! where the crucified Saviour, from his cross, is gazing upon you !
 See ! in those sorrowful eyes, what meekness and holy compassion !
 Hark, how those lips still repeat the prayer, "O Father, forgive them !"
 Let us repeat that prayer, in the hour when the wicked assail us ;
 Let us repeat it now, and say, "O Father, forgive them !"
 Few were his words of rebuke ; but deep in the hearts of the people
 Sank they, and sobs of contrition succeeded that passionate outbreak ;
 And they repeated his prayer, and said, 'O Father, forgive them !' "

If any preacher were foolish enough thus to address good Christians so situated, we trust that he would get well laughed at for his pains, and duly censured by his authorities, for his gross misinterpretation and mis-ap- plication of Scriptural precepts : but the foolish Acadians repented them forthwith of their righteous wrath and impulse to resistance, and

" Responded
 Not with their lips alone, but their hearts ; and the Ave Maria
 Sang they, and fell on their knees ; and their souls with devotion transported
 Rose, on the ardour of prayer, like Elijah ascending to heaven."

Our pity for Gabriel, the betrothed of the fair maiden, Evangeline, is certainly much diminished by knowing that he is one of this congregation of spoonies.

From the extracts we have given, our readers will see that the language of "Evangeline" is very far from answering to Coleridge's standard of poetical phraseology—"the best words in the best places." Mr. Longfellow's words are commonly about as well chosen as those of a first-rate novel writer. The true poet's invincible determination to hunt up from the recesses of his memory, *the word or words* which absolutely express his thought or feeling, is nowhere visible. He would, no doubt, think it great fastidiousness and loss of time, to spend half a day in getting a stanza *quite* right, which he has worked up to a "passable" point in half an hour. He has no sufficient feeling of the fact, that a poem is like the mirror of a telescope in this—that *it is the last rub which polishes it*, and makes it capable of reflecting the heavens. Many are the poets who have nearly scaled Parnassus, and who might have won to themselves enduring names, but that, discouraged by finding the mountain-side barren of laurels, they have refused the labour of the few additional steps which would have brought them to its verdant top.

But Mr. Longfellow's words are not only not the best words, they are not even in the best places. This is an inexcusable fault in a metre so extremely easy as that of "Evangeline." Inversions merely for the sake of getting the long and short syllables into due order, are never allowable, except in highly polished verse, where this, and other apparent carelessness, may be introduced with good effect to take off the appearance of laborious finish. Inversions are always allowable for *rhythmical* effect, which is quite a

different thing from mere metrical regularity. No one can wish that Cleopatra, in her wilful passion, should have exclaimed,

" Give me Mandragora to drink !"
 instead of

" Give me to drink Mandragora !"
 Or that the waves and winds that did omit

" Their mortal natures, letting go safely by
 The divine Desdemona,"

should have flowed, in Shakespeare's verse, with more regularity ; but Mr. Longfellow's inversions are seldom if ever of this character ; he rarely becomes sufficiently rhythmical, and never sufficiently polished in his writings, to justify inversions upon either of the foregoing pleas.

Notwithstanding all these, and other complaints which we might justly make against this poem, we gladly allow that it possesses very considerable merit as a versified romance. The numerous descriptions combine breadth with minuteness of detail very happily, and the story, which is decidedly a fine one, is told so as to work upon the feelings, and to elevate them. We say again that in these remarks we have laid disproportionate emphasis upon the blame deserved by the poem, because we consider that the praise which it has obtained has been out of all proportion to its deserts.

Mr. Longfellow has written a very poor drama, called "The Spanish Student." We cannot find in it any passages worth placing before our readers ; but there is one *stage-direction* which gives so amusing an example of American "notions" of European manners, that we must quote it. The heroine, Preciosa, is a Spanish gipsy-girl, a

famous *danseuse*; the Archbishop of Toledo has taken it into his head to put down the ballet in his diocese, and by way of ascertaining the full odiousness of the abuse to be extirpated, the Archbishop summons Preciosa to dance before him at his palace:—

"She lays aside her mantilla. The music of the cachucha is played, and the dance begins. The Archbishop and the Cardinal look on with gravity and an occasional frown; then make signs to each other; and, as the dance continues, become more and more pleased and excited, and at length rise from their seats, throw their caps in the air, and applaud vehemently as the scene closes."

"The Golden Legend" is a long poem of the worn-out Faust type, in which the devil is laid under contribution for a certain amount of theatrical effect, worldly wisdom, and would-be bitter sarcasm. There are, however, in this poem, two or three very beautiful passages, which we would willingly quote had we space; but we must hasten to close this notice of Mr. Longfellow with a few extracts from and comments upon his minor poems. These pieces, upon the whole, do not deserve anything like the degree of popularity which they have obtained; indeed, the great reputation which two or three of these poems enjoy, is a most melancholy sign of the poverty of the intellectual, and still more of the spiritual culture, of a very large portion of the "reading public." The following verses, entitled "A Psalm of Life: what the heart of the young man said to the Psalmist," have come to be quoted in our English House of Commons—a place not yet penetrated, if we remember rightly, by Tennyson, or even, except for ridicule, by Wordsworth.

"Tell me not in mournful numbers,
Life is but an empty dream!
For the soul is dead that slumbers,
And things are not what they seem.

"Life is real! Life is earnest!
And the grave is not its goal!
Dust thou art, to dust returnest,
Was not spoken of the soul.

"Not enjoyment, and not sorrow,
Is our destin'd end or way;
But to act that each to-morrow
Find us further than to-day.

"Art is long and time is fleeting,
And our hearts though stout and brave,
Still like muffled drums are beating
Funeral marches to the grave.

"In the world's broad field of battle,
In the bivouac of life,
Be not like dumb driven cattle;
Be a hero in the strife!

"Trust no future, how'er pleasant!
Let the dead past bury its dead!
Act—act in the living present,
Heart within, and God o'erhead!

"Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of Time.—

"Footprints that perhaps another,
Sailing o'er life's troubled main,
A forlorn and shipwrecked brother
Seeing, shall take heart again.

"Let us then be up and doing,
With a heart for any fate;
Still achieving, still pursuing,
Learn to labour and to wait."

A certain Frenchman, not being quite master of our language, is reported to have exclaimed, in a rapture of admiration at something or other, "*superbe! magnifique!*" in short, pretty well!" This exclamation expresses the sort of feeling one has upon reading verses like the above for the first time. It is flattering to find that one's most commonplace opinions are thought worthy of being expressed with such astounding emphasis; and we experience, upon reading them, much the same sort of self-complacency as was felt by the *bourgeois gentil-homme* upon discovering, for the first time, that he had been talking prose all his life. But when the first glow of self-love has subsided, we begin to be ashamed of ourselves, for having been duped by such a bundle of loud-tongued and "unimproved" commonplaces; and if we are very good-humoured and not very critical, we shall hush up the business with an "in short, pretty well." But *we*—the intelligent critics of the *North British Review*—cannot reconcile our consciences to any such amiable concealment of the real truth, which, in regard to the above verses, and many others like them in Mr. Longfellow's volume, is simply this, that they are, for the most part, pretentious, unprofitable, anti-Christian trash. What an unconscionable puppy the "young man" must have been—in the moment at least when his "heart" set up this "Psalm" in opposition to the words of the Psalmist! How the "man after God's own heart" would have quailed beneath this "sprightly Juvenal's" reproof! How much wholesome doctrine he lost by living so many centuries before this magnificent discovery of Mr. Longfellow's, that—

"Life is real! Life is earnest!
And the grave is not its goal."

We could be very funny at Mr. Longfel-

low's expense, had we space to enter into a philosophical analysis of this "Psalm of Life;" but we have to quote another famous effusion called

"EXCELSIOR.

"The shades of night were falling fast,
As through an Alpine village pass'd
A youth who bare, 'mid snow and ice,
A banner with this strange device—
Excelsior.

"His brow was sad; his eye beneath
Flash'd like a falchion from its sheath,
And like a silver clarion rung
The accents of that unknown tongue,
Excelsior!

"In happy homes he saw the light
Of household fires gleam warm and bright;
Above, the spectral glaciers shone,
And from his lips escaped a groan,
Excelsior!

"Try not the pass,' the old man said;
Dark lowers the tempest overhead,
The roaring torrent is deep and wide,
And loud that clarion voice replied,
Excelsior!

"O, stay,' the maiden said, 'and rest
Thy weary head upon this breast!
A tear stood in his bright blue eye,
But still he answer'd with a sigh,
Excelsior!

"Beware the pine-tree's wither'd branch,
Beware the awful avalanche!"
This was the peasant's last good night,
A voice replied far up the height,
Excelsior!

"At break of day, as heavenward
The pious monks of Saint Bernard
Utter'd the oft-repeated prayer,
A voice cried through the startled air,
Excelsior!

"A traveller, by the faithful hound,
Half buried in the snow was found;
Still grasping in his hands of ice
That banner with the strange device,
Excelsior!

"There, in the twilight, cold and gray,
Lifeless but beautiful he lay,
And from the sky, serene and far,
A voice fell like a falling star,
Excelsior!"

From the prevailing tone of Mr. Longfellow's works, we are justified in assuming, that the example of the young man whose progress is delineated in these spirited verses, is intended for our guidance, or rather for our reverent admiration, and not for our warning. All that we can say is, that we believe the intended moral to be the false one. Give the story its true moral,—the madness of any ambition which is found to

be incompatible with homely joys, female love, and unpretentious Christian religion, and we have an undeniably meritorious little poem, notwithstanding the evident "greenness" of the youth's enthusiasm, and his "clarion voice," and "bright blue eye," which do not add to his manliness.

Bryant is the Rogers of America. Probably his poem called "Thanatopsis" is the most finished piece of verse which has proceeded from the American press. We believe that it is regarded by the Americans themselves as their most classical production; and, as such, it has a right to a place in this notice:—

THANATOPSIS.

"To him who in the love of nature holds
Communion with her visible forms, she speaks
A various language; for his gayer hours
She has a voice of gladness, and a smile
And eloquence of beauty, and she glides
Into his darker musings with a mild
And healing sympathy, that steals away
Their sharpness ere he is aware. When thoughts
Of the last bitter hour come like a blight
Over thy spirit, and sad images
Of the stern agony, and shroud and pall,
And breathless darkness, and the narrow house,
Make thee to shudder, and grow sick at heart;
Go forth, under the open sky, and list
To nature's teachings, while from all around—
Earth and her waters, and the depth of air—
Comes a still voice. Yet a few days, and thee
The all-beholding sun shall see no more
In all his course; nor yet in the cold ground,
Where thy pale form was laid, with many tears,
Nor in the embrace of ocean shall exist
Thy image. Earth, that nourish'd thee shall claim
Thy growth to be resolved to earth again,
And lost each human trace, surrendering up
Thine individual being, shalt thou go
To mix for ever with the elements,
To be a brother to the insensible rock,
And to the sluggish clod, which the rude swain
Turns with his share, and treads upon. The oak
Shall send his roots abroad, and pierce thy mould;
Yet not to thine eternal resting-place
Shalt thou retire alone—nor couldst thou wish
Couch more magnificent. Thou shalt lie down
With patriarchs of the infant world—with kings,
The powerful of the earth—the wise, the good,
Fair forms, and hoary seers of ages past,
All in one mighty sepulchre. The hills,
Rock-ribb'd, and ancient as the sun—the vales
Stretching in pensive quietness between
The venerable woods—rivers that move
In majesty; and the complaining brooks
That make the meadows green; and pour'd round all
Old ocean's gray and melancholy waste,—
Are but the solemn decorations all
Of the great tomb of man. The golden sun,
The planets, all the infinite host of heaven,
Are shining on the sad abodes of death,
Through the still lapse of ages. All that tread
The globe are but a handful to the tribes
That slumber in its bosom. Take the wings
Of morning, and the Barcan desert pierce,
Or lose thyself in the continuous woods
Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
Save his own dashings; yet the dead are there,
And millions in those solitudes, since first
The flight of years began, have laid them down

In their last sleep—the dead reign there alone.
 So shalt thou rest; and what if thou withdraw
 Unheeded by the living—and no friend
 Take note of thy departure? All that breathe
 Will share thy destiny. The gay will laugh
 When thou art gone, the solemn brood of care
 Plod on, and each one as before will chase
 His favourite phantom; yet all these shall leave
 Their mirth and their employments, and shall come
 And make their bed with thee. As the long train
 Of ages glide away, the sons of men—
 The youth in life's green spring, and he who goes
 In the full strength of years, matron and maid,
 And the sweet babe, and the gray-headed man—
 Shall, one by one, be gather'd to thy side,
 By those who in their turn shall follow them.
 So live, that when thy summons comes to join
 The innumerable caravan, that moves
 To that mysterious realm, where each shall take
 His chamber in the silent halls of death,
 Thou go not, like the quarry slave at night,
 Scourged to his dungeon, but sustained and soothed
 By an unfaltering trust, approach thy grave
 Like one who wraps the drapery of his couch
 About him, and lies down to pleasant dreams."

In this Mr. Bryant has only just missed writing a fine poem; yet, alas! "a miss is as good as a mile." It is *not* a fine poem; for a fine poem ought to contain something unprecedented, in music or in meaning, and "Thanatopsis" contains nothing new at all. It has beautiful movements of verse, as, for example,—

"Yet a few days, and thee
 The all-beholding sun shall see no more
 In all his course."

It has admirable touches of imaginative description, as that of,—

"the continuous woods,
 Where rolls the Oregon, and hears no sound
 Save his own dashings."

Yet somewhere or other, in Wordsworth, or Shakespeare, or Young, or some one else, we have met with the same movements of verse, and nearly the same descriptive touches.

It must nevertheless be granted that such a poem as the above is incomparably preferable to many which have obtained a name for originality, but which, in truth, are merely insane endeavours after originality. "Originality," says Mr. Ruskin, "is never to be sought for its own sake, otherwise it will be mere aberration; it should arise naturally out of hard, independent study of nature." Mr. Bryant's study of nature may have been hard, but unfortunately it has not been independent. He has paced through field, forest, and city, observing many things; but it has always been with a volume of the English poets in his hand. He has, however, the high negative merit of not pretending to a greater degree of independence than he has a just claim to. He is manly, accomplished, sensitive in heart, eye, and ear; but

he is not, and does not pretend to be "original."

Mr. Thomas Buchanan Read, as we learn from the publisher's preface to his volume, which is published in England, is "one among the youngest of America's poets." This being the case, we do not hesitate to declare our opinion that he is the most promising of the living transatlantic poets. We know of no other American, with the doubtful exception of Edgar Poe, having so much real feeling as is shewn in some of Mr. Read's verses. His feeling is not very profound or masculine, but it is real; and it presents a refreshing contrast with the cold and clever manufactures, which most of his cotemporaries would impose upon us as expressions of feeling. Bloomfield's description of a storm, beginning—

"A chilling blast succeeds: the nearest cloud
 Sprinkles the bubbling pool," &c.,

is not more hearty and homely than Mr. Read's "Summer Shower."

"Before the stout harvesters falleth the grain,
 As when the strong storm-wind is reaping the plain,
 And loiters the boy in the briery lane;
 But yonder aslant comes the silvery rain,
 Like a long line of spears brightly burnished and tall.

"Adown the white highway, like cavalry fleet,
 It dashes the dust with its numberless feet.
 Like a murmurless school, in their leafy retreat,
 The wild birds sit listening, the drops round them beat;
 And the boy crouches close to the blackberry wall.

"The swallows alone take the storm on their wing,
 And, taunting the tree-sheltered labourers, sing.
 Like pebbles, the rain breaks the face of the spring,
 While a bubble darts up from each widening ring;
 And the boy, in dismay, hears the loud shower fall.

"But soon are the harvesters tossing the sheaves;
 The robin darts out from its bower of leaves;
 The wren peereth forth from its moss-covered eaves;
 And the rain-spattered urchin now gladly perceives
 That the beautiful bow bendeth over them all."

Mr. Read has a very high sense of natural beauty; this kind of description is his forte, although he does not seem to know it, for the most elaborate pieces in his volume are somewhat ineffective attempts at the delineation of human passion—for which he has scarcely sufficient depth and strength. As, notwithstanding its unusual merit, Mr. Read's volume is not likely to fall into the hands of the majority of our readers, we offer no apology for quoting the following exquisite poem, called the "Closing Scene," at length:—

"Within the sober realm of leafless trees
 The russet year inhaled the dreamy air;
 Like some tanned reaper in his hour of ease,
 When all the fields are lying brown and bare.

"The gray barns, looking from their hazy hills
 O'er the dim waters, widening in the vales,
 Sent down the air a greeting to the mills,
 On the dull thunder of alternate flails.

"All sights were mellowed, and all sounds subdued,
The hills seemed further, and the streams sang low;
As in a dream, the distant woodman hewed
His winter log with many a muffled blow.

"The embattled forests, erewhile, armed in gold,
Their banners bright with every martial hue,
Now stood, like some sad beaten host of old
Withdrawn afar in Time's remotest blue.

"On slumberous wings the vulture tried his flight;
The dove scarce heard his sighing mate's complaint;
And like a star, slow drowning in the light,
The village church vane seemed to pale and faint.

"The sentinel cock upon the hillside crew—
Crew thrice, and all was stiller than before—
Silent till some replying warbler blew
His alien horn, and then was heard no more.

"Where, erst, the jay within the elm's tall crest
Made garrulous trouble round her unfledged young;
And where the oriole hung her swaying nest,
By every light wind like a censer swung;

"Where sang the noisy masons of the eaves,
The busy swallows circling ever near,
Foreboding, as the rustic mind believes,
An early harvest, and a plentiful year:—

"Where every bird which charmed the vernal feast,
Shook the sweet slumber from its wings at morn,
To warn the reapers of the rosy east;—
All now was songless, empty, and forlorn.

"Alone, from out the stubble, piped the quail,
And croaked the crow, through all the dreary gloom;
Alone the pheasant, drumming in the vale,
Made echo to the distant cottage loom.

"There was no bud, no bloom upon the bowers;
The spiders wove their thin shrouds night by night;
The thistle-down, the only ghost of flowers,
Sailed slowly by—passed noiseless out of sight.

"Amid all this—in this most cheerless air,
And where the woodbine shed upon the porch
Its crimson leaves, as if the year stood there,
Firing the floor with his inverted torch;—

"Amid all this, the centre of the scene,
The white haired matron, with monotonous tread,
Plied the swift wheel, and with her joyless mien,
Sat like a Fate, and watched the flying thread.

"She had known sorrow. He had walked with her,
Oft supped, and broke with her the ashen crust;
And, in the dead leaves, still she heard the stir
Of his black mantle trailing in the dust.

"While yet her cheek was bright with summer bloom,
Her country summoned, and she gave her all,
And twice, war bowed to her his sable plume—
Re-gave the swords, to rust upon the wall.

"Re-gave the swords—but not the hand that drew,
And struck for liberty the dying blow;
Nor him, who to his sire and country true,
Fell 'mid the ranks of the invading foe.

"Long, but not loud, the droning wheel went on,
Like the low murmurs of a hive at noon;
Long, but not loud, the memory of the gone,
Breathed through her lips, a sad and tremulous tune.

"At last the thread was snapped—her head was bowed—
Life dropped the distaff through his hands serene;
And loving neighbours smoothed her careful shroud,
While Death and Winter closed the Autumn scene."

This is unquestionably the best American

poem we have met with; indeed it is, with one or two exceptions, the only American poem we have read, or could have read, over and over again. It is an addition to the permanent stock of poetry in the English language, and is worth a whole album of "Excelsiors," "Psalms of Life," and other such drum-and-trumpet moralities which are so abundantly supplied to an applauding public on this and on the other side of the Atlantic. There are faults in this little poem which greatly diminish its value as compared with what it ought to have been, and might have been, under the diligent and discerning polish of Mr. Read.

"The embattled forests erewhile armed in gold,
Their banners bright with every martial hue,"—

are a sad interruption to the tone of peaceful melancholy which is otherwise admirably sustained throughout the poem; and the image is, moreover, in itself, good for little or nothing. The five concluding stanzas are not nearly up to the mark of the preceding portion of the piece, which, as far as regards general construction and form, is almost spoilt by them. But the first thirteen stanzas, taken by themselves, constitute a truly inspired little poem. Tennyson himself, the great modern master of that kind of description which employs the objects of outward nature as a language for human feeling, has scarcely surpassed, in its way, this passage, which in our opinion, merits the fame that Gray's celebrated "Elegy" has obtained, without deserving it nearly so well. The feeling of the three opening stanzas—the only unexceptionable passage of more than two or three lines in Gray's poem—is here sustained to a far greater length, and with much simpler language and imagery. Mr. Read's volume affords other equally remarkable instances of perception and polish; but in no other instance does he seem to us to have arrived at such depth of poetical feeling. We would willingly quote the whole of "Love's Gallery," but for want of space must confine ourselves to two of its beautifully-finished portraits.

BERTHA.

"Mild Bertha's was a home withdrawn
Beyond the city's din;
Tall Lombard trees hemmed all the lawn
All up the long straight walks, a dawn
Of blossoms shone within.

"Along the pebble paths the maid
Walked with the early hours,
With careful hands the vines arrayed,
And plucked the small intruding blade
From formal plots of flowers.

"A statued Dian to the air
Bequeathed its mellow light;
She called the flying figure fair,
The forward eyes and backward hair,
And praised the marble's white.

"Her pulses coursed their quiet ways
From heart to head controlled;
She read and praised, in studied phrase,
The bards whom it were sin to praise
In measured words and cold.

"I love the broad, bright world of snow,
And every strange device
Which makes the woods a frozen show,
The rivers hard and still; but, oh,
Ne'er loved a heart of ice."

AURELIA.

"Where flamed a field of flowers, and where
Sang noisy birds and brooks,
Aurelia to the frolic air
Shook down her wanton waves of hair
With laughter-loving looks.

"Her large and lustrous eyes of blue,
Dashed with the dew of mirth,
Bequeathed to all their brilliant hue;
She saw no shades, nor even knew
She walked the heavy earth.

"Her ringing laughter woke the dells
When fell the autumn blight;

She sang through all the rainy spells,—
For her the snow was full of bells,
Of music and delight.

"She swept on her bewildering way,
By every pleasure kissed—
Making a mirth of night and day;
A brook all sparkle and all spray,
Dancing itself to mist.

"I love all bright and happy things,
And joys which are not brief;
All sights and sounds whence pleasure springs;
But weary of the harp whose strings
Are never tuned to grief."

We regret that we are compelled to add,
that in Mr. Read's volume, as in the volumes
of nearly all young poets who have ever
written, there is much that the world will
willingly let die.

Edgar Poe is more generally known
among us for his prose tales than for his
poetry, of which he has written very little.
He has produced one poem which will be re-
membered and read when nine-tenths of the
popular poets of the day shall be forgotten.

Our readers will thank us for adorning our
pages with this piece, which is called "The
Raven," in its integrity.

"Once upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered weak and weary,
Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore—
While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,
As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door—
'Tis some visitor,' I muttered, 'tapping at my chamber door—
Only this, and nothing more.'

"Ah, distinctly I remember, it was in the bleak December,
And each separate dying ember wrought its ghost upon the floor.
Eagerly I wished the morrow; vainly had I sought to borrow
From my books surcease of sorrow—sorrow for the lost Lenore—
For the rare and radiant maiden, whom the angels call Lenore—
Nameless here for evermore.

"And the silken sad uncertain rustling of each purple curtain
Thrilled me—filled me with fantastic terrors never felt before;
So that now, to still the beating of my heart, I stood repeating,
'Tis some visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door,
Some late visitor entreating entrance at my chamber door,
That it is, and nothing more.'

"Presently my soul grew stronger; hesitating then no longer,
'Sir,' said I, 'or Madam, truly your forgiveness I implore;
But the fact is, I was napping; and so gently you came rapping,
And so faintly you came tapping, tapping at my chamber door,
That I scarce was sure I heard you,'—here I opened wide the door,
Darkness there, and nothing more.

"Deep into that darkness peering long I stood there, wondering, fearing,
Doubting, dreaming dreams no mortal ever dared to dream before;
But the silence was unbroken, and the stillness gave no token,
And the only word there spoken was the whispered word 'Lenore!'
This I whispered, and an echo murmured back the word 'Lenore!'
Merely this, and nothing more.

"Back into the chamber turning, all my soul within me burning,
Soon again I heard a tapping, something louder than before:
'Surely,' said I 'surely that is something at my window lattice;
Let me see then what thereat is, and this mystery explore—
Let my heart be still a moment, and this mystery explore;—
'Tis the wind, and nothing more.'

"Open here I flung the shutter, when with many a flirt and flutter,
In there stepped a stately Raven of the saintly days of yore :
Not the least obeisance made he ; not a minute stopped or stayed he ;
But with mien of Lord or Lady, perched above my chamber door—
Perched upon a bust of Pallas, just above my chamber door—
Perched, and sat, and nothing more.

"Then this ebony bird beguiling my sad fancy into smiling,
By the grave and stern decorum of the countenance it wore,
'Though thy crest be shorn and shaven, thou,' I said, 'art sure no craven,
Ghastly, grim, and ancient Raven, wandering from the nightly shore,
Tell me what thy lordly name is, on the night's Plutonian shore !'
Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore.'

"Much I marvelled this ungainly fowl to hear discourse so plainly,
Though its answer little meaning, little relevancy bore ;
For we cannot help agreeing, that no living human being
Ever yet was blessed with seeing bird above his chamber door—
Bird or beast upon the sculptured bust above his chamber door—
With such a name as 'Nevermore.'

"But the Raven, sitting lonely, on that placid bust spake only
That one word, as if his soul, in that one word, he did outpour.
Nothing further then he uttered ; not a feather then he fluttered :
Till I scarcely more than muttered, 'other friends have flown before ;
On the morrow *he* will leave me, as my hopes have flown before ;'
Then the bird said, 'Nevermore.'

"Startled by the silence broken by reply so aptly spoken ;
'Doubtless,' said I, 'what it utters is its only stock and store,
Caught from some unhappy master, whom unmerciful disaster
Followed fast, and followed faster, till his songs one burden bore—
Till the dirges of his hope that melancholy burden bore
Of 'never—nevermore.'

"But the Raven still beguiling all my sad soul into smiling,
Straight I wheeled a cushioned seat in front of bird and bust and door ;
Then, upon the velvet sinking, I betook myself to linking
Fancy into fancy, thinking what this ominous bird of yore—
What this grim, ungainly, ghastly, quaint, and ominous bird of yore
Meant in croaking 'Nevermore.'

"This I sat engaged in guessing, but no syllable expressing
To the fowl whose fiery eyes now turned into my bosom's core ;
This, and more, I sat divining, with my head at ease reclining
On the cushion's velvet lining, that the lamp-light gloated o'er,
But whose velvet violet lining with the lamp-light gloating o'er,
She shall press, ah, nevermore !

"Then, methought the air grew denser, perfumed from an unseen censer,
Swung by seraphim whose foot-falls tinkled on the tufted floor.
'Wretch !' I cried, 'thy God hath lent thee—by these angels he hath sent thee
Respite—respite and nepenthe from thy memories of Lenore !
Quaff, oh, quaff this kind nepenthe, and forget this lost Lenore !'
Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore !'

"Prophet,' said I, 'thing of evil, prophet still, if bird or devil !
Whether tempter sent, or whether tempest tossed thee here ashore,
Desolate, yet all undaunted, on this desert land enchanted—
On this home, by horror haunted—tell me truly, I implore,—
Is there, *is* there balm in Gilead ? tell me, tell me, I implore !'
Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore !'

"Prophet,' said I, 'thing of evil, prophet still, if bird or devil !
By that heaven that bends above us—by that God we both adore—
Tell this soul with sorrow laden, if within the distant Aidenn
It shall clasp a sainted maiden, whom the angels call Lenore—
Clasp a rare and radiant maiden, whom the angels call Lenore.'
Quoth the Raven, 'Nevermore !'

"Be that word our sign of parting, bird or fiend," I shrieked, upstarting,
 'Get thee back into the tempest and the night's Plutonian shore!
 Leave no black plume as a token of that lie thy soul hath spoken!
 Leave my loneliness unbroken!—quit the bust above my door!
 Take thy beak from out my heart, and take thy form from off my door!"
 Quoth the Raven, "Nevermore!"

"And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting, still is sitting
 On the pallid bust of Pallas, just above my chamber door;
 And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming,
 And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his shadow on the floor;
 And my soul from out that shadow that lies flitting on the floor,
 Shall be lifted nevermore."

Our readers will all agree with us in pronouncing this poem to be one of unquestionable merit. It exhibits a truly extraordinary mastery over most of the difficulties of verse. The power of rhyme displayed in it has not been surpassed or even equalled in our time, except by the late Thomas Hood. The metre is, in the abstract, a very fine one; like all very fine metres, its movement once heard can never be forgotten; and it has the additional merit of being perfectly adapted to the subject: the cadence at the end of each stanza is, by itself, expressive of the calm and settled, and almost careless sorrow conveyed by the words. The phraseology is extremely colloquial, without being at all undignified; and the prevailing sentiment, though deeply mournful, and verging upon despair, is never unmanly in its tone. We have endeavoured, in our extracts, to take the high-water marks of American poetry in its different kinds; and as in Mr. Read's "Closing Scene" we have the best example we could find of the passive or feminine phase of poetical feeling, so here we have the highest example which America has yet produced of that manliness of passion which will rather relieve itself by laughter than by tears. Nothing can be better in its way than the mechanism of this poem. The expression of the sentiment upon which the poem is founded is most elaborately wrought out; and no poetical aid that could have been thought of is wanting. Mr. Poe has written other poems, but none of them, in our opinion, is comparable to this. He has also published a number of tales, which are of a very extraordinary character. They deal mainly in the simply horrible and marvellous; but these common elements of effect are managed with such unusual power, and in such a peculiar manner, that they cease to be vulgar. In the recent death of this young poet and romancist America has suffered a loss which will be more appreciated fifty years hence than it is now.

We have now placed before our readers the very best blossoms out of the garden—a very wide one—of American verse. The number of "respectable" versifiers who have

come into existence in America, during the last few years, is surprising. The fertility of the New World in the production of mediocre poets exceeds even that of our own land. Indeed, almost every American seems to be possessed of the "accomplishment of verse" to some considerable degree. But that American poets are deficient in the "faculty divine," which shews us thoughts, and feelings, and facts from a totally new point of view, and spiritually enriches us with the revelation of an individuality quite different from our own or any other with which we have hitherto become acquainted, must be abundantly manifest to those of our readers who possess the amount of originality which is requisite to enable them to recognise true originality in others. Unquestionable as is the merit of each of the four writers whom we have selected as being, to our mind, the best of the American poets, we must confess that it never rises to a higher mark than this—that their poetry equals first-class modern English poetry *in its own way*: that is to say, they have succeeded in producing repetitions—which are not necessarily imitations—of first-rate original poetry; but have never attained to the production of first-rate original poetry themselves.

In conclusion, let us throw together a few recommendations which it seems especially desirable that American poets should follow, if they would ever rise above their present mediocrity, which is not tolerable to "gods or men," although, unfortunately for the poets themselves, it is tolerated by women, and therefore by "columns."

Follow, in poetry, the artistic law of architecture, which adopts, perfects, and displays, with the utmost degree of ostentation, the essential, but nothing else. Unsuperfluosity is the invariable effect and the most powerful means of expressing real passion; and it can never be too often repeated that, in a good poem, all the words must be *the* words; for true feeling, if it is able to express itself at all, does so with perfect accuracy and eloquence.

Do not write in metres that you do not

understand. It is difficult to do full justice even to the simplest metres; but we find now-a-days the merest novices in verse attempting to dance in fetters which could hardly be worn gracefully by the mightiest poets.

In choosing your subject, and in deciding upon your method of treating it, remember that simple nature is full of endless significance and symbolism; meaning within meaning, like—

“Laborious orient ivory, sphere in sphere;”

and that the great difficulty in art is not to infuse nature with significance; but to apprehend and express the significance of nature. To do this properly, demands that your imagination should have received the highest religious culture; otherwise you will fall foul either of Pietism or Pantheism—extremes which are equally fatal to the poet.

Bear in mind the vast responsibility of public utterance. It is bad to become, like Milton’s devil, “a liar in four hundred mouths,” or more, by speaking without regard to the truth of the universe, in the most ephemeral magazine or newspaper; but how greatly aggravated is the crime of him who, in hope at least, is writing for all time, and raising, for aught he cares, a standing miracle of iniquity—for such is the proper designation of certain “works of art” which we could name, but will not, lest we should be charged with bigotry.

In intellect, no less than in action, the way of life is narrow, and in intellect, far more than in action, the temptation to pursue “the broad way and the green” is mighty. But heavenly truth, like heavenly life, is found to be “exceeding broad” when we are once really in the fruition of it. “He that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully; what is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord.” We know the things that truly concern us, and in what Book they are to be sought; and “if any man shall add to these things, God shall add to him the plagues that are written in this Book; and if any man shall take away from the words of the Book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the Book of Life.” Again, “The words of the Lord are pure words, as silver tried in a furnace of earth, purified seven times.” Such should be, such *must* be the true poet’s words; for, bear well in mind, that finish in art is not a question of surface, but of essence; finished expression is nothing more nor less than perfectly *true* expression; and all want of finish is simply want of truth. “How forcible are right words!” exclaims Job;

and he might, alas! have exclaimed, with almost equal justice, “How forcible are wrong words!”

Do not, however, fancy that the execution is the only stage of your work at which you are to pray for inspiration. The greatest labour and the deepest inspiration of a large work must come before what is commonly called its execution. It is far better that the execution of your idea should be imperfect, than that the idea itself should lack worth and adequate general development.

Beware of the modern tendency to be unartistically explicit. Be as explicit as you can consistently with that primary demand of your art, *extreme condensation and pregnant*; but remember that poetical language is *representative and suggestive*, and not, like prosaic, or “scientific” language, *arbitrary and exhaustive*. In Swedenborg’s “Heaven and Hell,” where he describes the language of the angels, there are some passages which come nearer than any we have ever met with to a description of what poetical language ought to be:—

“This language is not learned artificially, but is inherent in every one; for it flows direct from their affection and thought. The sound of their speech corresponds to their affection, and the articulations of sound composing the words correspond to the ideas of their thought proceeding from their affection; and as their language corresponds to these, it likewise is spiritual, being in reality audible affection and speaking thought. Whoever attends to the subject may be aware that all thought proceeds from affection, and that the ideas of thought are various forms into which the common affection is distributed; for no thought or idea can possibly exist without affection, it being from this that it derives its soul and life. . . . The angelic tongue has nothing in common with human [prosaic] languages, except with certain words, the sound of which is derived from some affection. Since the speech of the angels corresponds to their affection, which belongs to their love, and the love that prevails in heaven is love to the Lord, and love towards the neighbour, it is evident how elegant and pleasing must be their discourse; for it not only affects the ears, but also the interiors of the minds of those who hear it. There was a certain spirit, remarkable for hardness of heart, with whom an angel was speaking, and who at length burst into tears: he said that he could not help it, for what he heard was love itself speaking; and that he had never wept before. The speech of the angels is also full of wisdom, because it proceeds from their interior thought, and their interior thought is wisdom, as their interior affection is love. In their speech their love and wisdom are united, whence it is so full of wisdom that they are able to express by a single word what man cannot in a thousand.”—*Heaven and Hell*, translated by S. Noble, pp. 94-96.

Above all things, let the modern poet take

the commonplace warning to beware of self-conceit, which, if allowed to get possession of him, will stop the development of his faculties, and destroy the powers to the use of which he has already attained. This is the age of the priestcraft of the intellect. We have cast off the bondage of those who would have influenced us unduly, in the name of God; but we have assumed the chains of a worse servitude in humbling ourselves before men who preach in their own names, for their own glory. This is not the place for an appeal to the self-degrading worshippers of the "intellect"—a class of persons who are only less miserable than those who treat superior faculty and information with disrespect. Our word is to the "men of intellect" themselves; particularly to the men of that kind of intellect which owes its power to health and vigour of imagination. To these we say, Do not be led astray by the adulation of your foolish worshippers; take your popularity to pieces, and see what it is really worth. True fame must come from men who are your equals, or superiors, in gifts of mind; and these do not make their voices heard, until popularity which comes from those who are lower in the scale of intellect than yourself, has done with its loud and fitful blasts. To beseech you, with many arguments, to remember that he is the greatest who is, in heart as well as in work, the servant of all, would be to trespass upon the office of the Christian pastor; but there is one humiliating fact which we may here impress upon those who, justly or not, think themselves to be great among the teachers of others, and the glorifiers in verse, or otherwise of the works of God. It is certain that the sense of truth and loveliness which makes you eloquent, is inferior in force to the sense of the same truth and loveliness which makes others *silent*. Hear the sentence of the most inspired man of modern times:—

"Men adroit

In speech, and for communion with the world
Accomplished, minds whose faculties are then
Most active when they are most eloquent,
And elevated most, when most admired.
Men may be found of other mould than these;
Who are their own upholders, to themselves
Encouragement, and energy, and will;
Expressing liveliest thoughts in lively words,
As native passion dictates. Others, too,
There are among the walks of homely life,
Still higher men, for contemplation framed;
Shy and unpractised in the strife of phrase;
Meek men, whose very souls, perhaps, would sink
Beneath them summoned to such intercourse.
Theirs is the language of the heavens, the power,
The thought, the image, and the silent joy:
Words are but under agents in their souls;
When they are grasping with their greatest
strength

They do not breathe among them. This I speak
In gratitude to God, who feeds our hearts
For his own service, knoweth, loveth us,
When we are unregarded by the world."

ART. V.—*The Life and Letters of Barthold George Niebuhr; with Essays on his Character and Influence.* By the Chevalier BUNSEN and Professors BRANDIS and LOEBELL. 2 vols. London, 1852.

THE name of Niebuhr has been long familiar to all English scholars. Nowhere, perhaps, have his historical inquiries met with a truer sympathy and appreciation than in England. Nowhere has he found at once more admiring and discriminating pupils. And there are very many who know but little of his writings directly, who are yet conversant with his name and the general character of his labours,—embalmed as they are in the affectionate and weighty words of Arnold, and associated with the widely-popular "Lays" of Macaulay.

Familiar, however, as Niebuhr's name is, and popular as the fruits of his studies may be said to have become, there has been hitherto little known in England of his personal history. For all German readers, indeed, there were the ample means of this knowledge in the "*Leben's Nachrichten über Barthold George Niebuhr*," edited by the careful and kindly hands of his sister-in-law, Madame Hensler. But this work, in three large volumes, and presenting a mass of materials for a life, rather than being itself a life of the historian, was not inviting save to the student, and however much prized in Germany, was but little read in this country. We give a hearty welcome, therefore, to the above volumes. It is true that they cannot, any more than the German work, upon which they are founded, be properly termed a "Life of Niebuhr." They do not aim to give us, in a complete and artistic form, the portrait of the Man and of the Student as he lived and studied. This is a task that still remains to be done, and that would well reward the doing. But they give us, in a more compact and readable form, the substance of the German work—the most interesting of the numerous letters which chiefly compose it, with the biographical notices of Madame Hensler condensed, and "a considerable amount of additional information." The narrative portions are not interspersed everywhere among the letters, according to the prevalent custom of memoir writers, but they stand in separate detach-

ments, at the head of each section of letters, arranged so as to apply to a separate section of the author's life. This is, we think, a preferable mode of arrangement, and especially as serving more directly to discriminate the character of *memoirs* from *biography* in any true sense of the term. It is of great importance to preserve this distinction, but too apt to be forgotten. We rejoice, therefore, in any feature which tends more clearly to bring it out; which more prominently marks the former, as they properly are only "Accounts of a Life"*—what the French call "*Memoirs pour servir, &c.*;" materials from which afterwards the shapely and consummate edifice of the Life may be reared by the hand of the artist, but not by any means the Life itself.

Viewing the work in this, its true light, it is one rich in excellence. We do not know, indeed, any work of our time we should more earnestly desire to see in the hands of every student; so instinct is it with all those noblest lessons which the student needs; so bright with interest and meaning for him on every page. Nor is it in a merely biographical point of view by any means devoid of attraction. It presents us with a wide and varied feature, which, if it is but nakedly unfolded here and there, is yet largely illuminated by the author's own graphic powers of description, and the softened and tender lights of an unfailing sympathy with all that is most pure and beautiful in Life, Literature, and Art. We trace, with a somewhat vivid impression, the features of Niebuhr's parental home in Ditmarsh; the singular depth and compass of his early studies; the experiences of his British travel; the vicissitudes and difficulties of his diplomatic career; his earnest aspirations and untiring labours as a student; and, above all, the high and noble principles that constantly animated him; and his lovely and overflowing affectionateness as a son, a husband, and a father.

It is our intention in the present paper to exhibit, in some degree, this impression of Niebuhr, especially in those relations in which he has been hitherto least known among us. We shall be led also to advert to his special position and character as an historian, and the impulse which he so widely imparted to historical criticism; but it is with the Man and the Student generally that we shall for the most part concern ourselves.

Barthold George Niebuhr was born at Copenhagen on the 29th of August 1776. His father, the well-known Carsten Niebuhr, the oriental traveller, was a man of great

energy and simplicity of character, distinguished for political shrewdness, and earnestly devoted to geographical and historical studies. Of his mother there is little known. She seems, however, to have been a woman of education and refinement—delicate in health, and sensitive in temperament; with warm and somewhat irritable affections, yet easily pacified, affectionate, and tender. Barthold obviously inherited from both his parents their characteristic qualities;—his enthusiasm for geographical and historical lore, and a certain tenacity of disposition, from his father: his depth and tenderness of feeling, and a certain impatience and hastiness of judgment from his mother, whom he is also said to have chiefly resembled in personal features.

His father, on his return from his Arabian travels, settled first in Copenhagen, and subsequently in Meldorf, the chief town of the province of Ditmarsh, to which he was made secretary. This remote home of his childhood left a strong influence both on the tastes and opinions of Niebuhr. Flat, marshy, and treeless, his youthful eye rested on no object of external beauty; a circumstance to which he attributed his long-continued insensibility to the charms of nature. The country, however, was rich in a certain historical interest, highly prized by Niebuhr. There still survived in the province, remnants of its old republican institutions which he studied with great curiosity. Every reader of his history must remember how familiarly his mind recurs to these relics of Ditmarshian republicanism, in his efforts to throw light upon points in the ancient Roman constitution. The solitude of the place, with only his books and his father to guide his studies, helped also strongly to nourish in him that habit of independent inquiry which was the spring of all his future distinction. He learned, as a mere boy, that bold self-confidence in the value of his studies which clung to him through life, and which, amid so much that might have permanently withdrawn his attention from them, led him ever to return to them with all the fondness of a first love, and all the energy of a paramount duty.

The boy early distinguished himself by his quickness and intelligence. His memory, which in mature life was so remarkable, displayed its strength from the very first. His father, writing to Eckhardt, his brother-in-law, when he was only six years old, says, "He studied the Greek alphabet only for a single day, and had no further trouble with it: he did it with very little help from me. The boy gets on wonderfully. Boje says he does not know his equal; but he requires

* Lebensnachrichten.

to be managed in a peculiar way. May God preserve our lives and give us grace to guide him right."

The Boje mentioned in this letter of his father, exercised a lively and happy influence over the mind of the young student. He was prefect of the province, and at the same time a literary personage of some consequence, being editor of the "*Deutsches Museum*." He had an extensive library, rich in French and English, as well as German books, to which young Niebuhr had free access. He appears to have taken a warm interest in the boy's education; and to have sought to foster in him, above all, those aesthetic and poetic impulses, which were most likely to be neglected under the mere tuition of his father. In a letter of Boje's, written in 1783, he thus speaks of his young friend and his studies:—"This reminds me of little Niebuhr. His docility, his industry, and his devoted love for me, procure me many a pleasant hour. A short time back I was reading '*Macbeth*' aloud to his parents, without taking any notice of him, till I saw what an impression it made upon him. Then I tried to render it all intelligible to him, and even explained to him how the witches were only poetical beings. When I was gone, he sat down (he is not yet seven years old) and wrote it all out in seven sheets of paper, without omitting one important point, and certainly without any expectation of receiving praise for it: for when his father asked to see what he had written, and showed it to me, he cried for fear he had not done it well. Since then he writes down everything of importance that he hears from his father or me."

The intellectual activity of "little Niebuhr" appears certainly to have been of an extraordinary kind. Essays, poetical paraphrases from the classics, sketches of little poems, a translation of Poncet's *Travels in Ethiopia*, an historical and geographical description of Africa, written in 1789, when he was only eleven years of age, attest the wonderful excitement and varied range of his mental capacity. When only in his eighth year, he could without help read any English book; and from about the same period, he began to share in the warm interest in literature which prevailed in Germany towards the close of last century, and eagerly welcomed the appearance of any new work from the pens of Klopstock, Lessing, and Goethe. These are almost the verbal statements of his biographer, who continues:—"But that interest in politics which became the master spring of his life, was first awakened at about the age of eleven. It is said that when the war with Turkey

broke out in the year 1789, it so strongly excited the child's mind, that he not only talked of it in his sleep at night, but fancied himself in his dreams reading the newspapers, and repeating the intelligence they contained about the war; and his ideas on these subjects were so well arranged, and founded on so accurate a knowledge of the country, and the situation of the towns, that the realization of his nightly anticipations generally appeared in the journals a short time afterward."

The well-known poet Voss, who had married Boje's sister, occasionally visited Meldorf at this time. The great scholar speedily discovered Niebuhr's wonderful talents, and gave him all assistance he could in his classical studies. Amid causes of subsequent estrangement, the latter never forgot the kindness which he owed to the author of "*Luise*."

The remarkable attainments of the boy seem to have attracted much attention about this period among the learned visitors of his father and Boje. In the conversations which took place among them, "he was frequently called upon," it is said, "to take a part, (being only eleven or twelve years of age,) and not seldom information was asked of him regarding geographical, statistical, historical, and other subjects, and given in a manner which excited their astonishment. His statistical knowledge was even then extraordinary: he was frequently assiduously engaged in subjects of this nature, such for instance as writing out lists of mortality."

The boy's character, in less favourable circumstances, could hardly have escaped the evil effects of such premature excitement. But his extreme natural simplicity, combined with the example of his father, and frequent expressions on the part of his mother, showing how little she valued these things, effectually protected him from all tendency to vanity. There was, besides, a depth as well as quickness of apprehension in him, which even now, as so strikingly in later years, could not brook any mere superficial display.

In his thirteenth year Niebuhr went to the Gymnasium at Meldorf. In a letter from his father dated 1788, he says,—"Barthold has not troubled his head so much about the Turks and the Emperor for some time past, but has made up his mind to enter the highest class at Easter, and is therefore busily engaged with the history of literature. He revels so in the Latin authors that I am almost obliged to restrain his ardour." He very soon outstripped his fellow-scholars, and acquired all he could at the Gymnasium. The Principal, Dr. Jäger,

however, offered to advance his studies privately, and prepare him for the University,—an offer which was gladly accepted. He read with him the most difficult passages of the Greek and Latin authors, and gave him hints which enabled him to perfect his acquaintance with them. His industry was amazing. “More than half the day he gave to hard work, some hours to general reading, and a very short time to recreation and social pleasures.”

All this intellectual exertion was undoubtedly excessive, and could not have failed to prove injurious, save from the rare strength and elasticity of Niebuhr’s mental capacity. His studies were also at this time, as he himself afterwards complained, diffused over too wide and desultory a field. Still the finely balanced power and tone of his mind enabled him to pass comparatively unharmed through disadvantages which might have seriously retarded the progress of others; while there is undoubtedly something very noble in the mere absorbing ardour of his studious devotion. We do not know of a more impressive example of strenuous self-culture from the earliest years—of a youth devoted with such pure zeal and unconscious simplicity of aim to intellectual and moral discipline.

The French revolution of 1791 deeply affected him, but not as it did so many young minds of that period. It was even at this early age not so much the bright as the dark side of that great event on which his mind dwelt. Friend as he was of liberty, he was imbued with so passionate a love of order, that he was no less prone now than in later years to see beneath the revolutionary assertion of popular rights all the horrors of anarchy and popular tyranny.

In the year 1792, Niebuhr went to Ham-burgh to school. Here he formed the friendship of Klopstock and the geographer Ebeling; and his residence amid a wider and more varied circle both of men of letters and youth of his own age, than he had hitherto enjoyed, promised him many advantages, which would have been of great service to him in some parts of his future career; but taken with vehement home-sickness, he returned to his father’s house after only three months’ absence.

The two subsequent years were spent at Meldorf in a similar round of study as before. The modern languages especially engaged his attention. Already familiar with French, English, and Italian, he now applied himself particularly to acquire Spanish and Portuguese. Here is the somewhat frightful catalogue given by his father in 1807 of the languages he then knew:—“1. German, as

his mother-tongue, he learned at school; 2. Latin; 3. Greek; 4. Hebrew; and besides, in Meldorf, he learned, 5. Danish; 6. English; 7. French; 8. Italian; but only so far as to be able to read a book in these languages: some books from a vessel wrecked on the coast induced him to learn, 9. Portuguese; 10. Spanish; of Arabic he did not learn much at home, because I had lost my lexicon, and could not quickly replace it. In Kiel and Copenhagen he had opportunities of practice in speaking and writing French, English, and Danish; in Copenhagen he learnt, 11. Persian, (of Count Ludolph, the Austrian minister, who was born at Constantinople, and whose father was an acquaintance of mine;) and 12. Arabic, he taught himself; in Holland he learnt, 13. Dutch; and again in Copenhagen he learnt, 14. Swedish, and a little Icelandic; at Memel, 15. Prussian; 16. Slavonic; 17. Polish; 18. Bohemian; and 19. Illyrian; with the addition of Low German, this makes in all twenty languages.”

In 1794 Niebuhr commenced his studies at the university of Kiel. The society into which he there entered proved a source of great enjoyment to him. With the aged Professor Hensler he contracted a particular intimacy, and in his house first made the acquaintance of Madame Hensler, (the Professor’s daughter-in-law,) who was destined to exercise so strong an influence on the whole future course of his life. She is described as “a woman of strong and healthy mind, with much decision of character, combined with deep feeling, and no ordinary cultivation—one of those women whose clear and correct judgment and ever ready sympathy render them through life the persons to whom all their friends instinctively turn for advice and assistance.” At Kiel, as in his father’s house, philology and history continued to be our Student’s favourite pursuits. The Greek and Roman classics were now so familiar to him that he only indulged himself in such reading as a recreation. He was so thoroughly imbued with their spirit, that he may be said to have lived more easily in the world disclosed by them, than in the actual world around him. The ancient classical life in its great facts and features was realized by him with a vividness such as no one, we fancy, ever excelled or perhaps equalled. In that old Ethnic world he dwelt familiarly as an inhabitant—pleased with its joys and responsive to its sorrows. “He once told a friend who had called on him and found him in great emotion, that he often could not bear to read more than a few pages at a time in the old tragic poets; he realized so vividly

all that was said and done and suffered, by the persons represented. He could see Antigone leading her blind father—the aged Œdipus entering the grove—he could catch the music of their speech, and felt certain that he could distinguish the true accent of the Greeks, though he could not reproduce it with his barbarian tongue.”

At this time, too, he gave himself with considerable zeal to the study of philosophy, especially the system of Kant, then expounded in the University with great enthusiasm by Rheinhold. The abstruse subtleties of the metaphysics of his country do not seem, however, now, or at any time, to have had much charm for Niebuhr. He appears himself to have been conscious of his inaptitude for them. We miss that hearty intelligence about his allusions to philosophy which distinguish his allusions to his other studies. The Concrete in life or in history had alone surpassing interest for him, and only in the contemplation and comprehension of it did his mind find full gratification, or show its full strength. Those merely intellectual difficulties, which the transcendental philosophy sought to resolve, scarcely discover themselves throughout all his letters, written as they often were amid the thick of metaphysical contention around him. History—the more he sought to apply himself to philosophy—appeared to him as his true vocation. “History,” he says, “grows dearer and dearer to me, so much so, that my ardour in reading history interferes with my zeal for philosophy, while no philosophy can blunt my inclination for history.”

The series of his letters begin with his residence at Kiel. Their interest at this early stage consists almost entirely in the light which they throw upon his studies. He had begun already to indulge some original speculations respecting ancient history. The following extract from a letter to his parents, dated Kiel, 7th June 1794, explains in some degree the nature of these speculations:—

“I have not as yet fully explained to anybody but Hensler, my ideas about the colonization of Greece and the whole of Asia Minor, including Armenia from the west. For the peopling of the rest of Asia, I assume, 1. the Aramaic, or Assyrian race, to which belong the Arabs, Jews, Syrians, Assyrians, Chaldees, and Medes, of more or less pure descent; 2. the Indo-Persic; 3. the Tartar; 4. the Mongol; 5. probably the Chinese race. Taking this as a basis, we can proceed further, and shall obtain everywhere at last the same result, viz., that these great national races have never sprung from the growth of a single family into a nation, but always from the association of several

families of human beings, raised above their fellow-animals by the nature of their wants, and the gradual invention of a language. each of which families probably had originally formed a language peculiar to itself. This last idea belongs to Reinhold. By this I explain the immense variety of languages among the North American savages, which it is absolutely impossible to refer to any common source, but which, in some cases, have resolved themselves into one language, as in Mexico and Peru for instance; and also the number of synonyms in the earliest periods of languages. On this account I maintain, that we must make a very cautious use of differences of languages, as applied to the theory of races, and have more regard to physical conformation, which latter is exactly the same, for instance, in most of the Indian tribes of North America.”—Vol. i. pp. 38, 39.

We add to this the following noble words from a letter of a few months' later date—words which, as they reveal so clearly the genuine spirit of self-culture which animated young Niebuhr, well deserve the earnest attention of every student:—

“Knowledge, what is commonly called learning, mere dull memory-work, will never be the aim of my exertions. The one thing needful is to cultivate one's understanding for one's self, so as to render it capable of production. He who merely crams himself with the conceptions of other men's minds, clothed in forms foreign to his own nature, will never accomplish much. Quiet and independent energetic industry can alone attain to what is true, and bring forth what is really useful.”

While at Kiel Niebuhr largely extended his literary acquaintance, not only among the professors and students, but within a circle composed of some of the most highly gifted men of the time—then resident at Holstein. “The little city of Eutin, delightfully situated on the wooded shores of an extensive lake, about twenty miles from Kiel, formed a sort of centre to this circle.” Here, or in the immediate neighbourhood, lived the two brothers Stolberg. Here were also Jacobi, and Voss, (Niebuhr's old acquaintance,) who was rector of the Gymnasium of the place. Of these illustrious men, Jacobi perhaps exercised the greatest influence over him. There was a purity and elevation about the philosopher's character which lent a softening and impressive wisdom to all his discourse, peculiarly attractive to Niebuhr. There was the same moral earnestness in both—the same love for the ideally beautiful in life and manners which, as it at once drew them together, formed a bond of union between them which was only broken by death. Of Voss, Niebuhr's admiration was at this time at the highest

point. To his friend Count Moltke he unbosoms himself regarding him with an enthusiasm which, while very characteristic of the writer, is not without interest in reference to the subject. Count Adam Moltke, we should observe, was one of Niebuhr's dearest friends at this period and afterwards. He formed his acquaintance during the second year of his college-life, and the warmest attachment speedily sprung up betwixt them—an attachment to which Niebuhr's letters everywhere testify. To him he thus writes, on 4th August 1795, of Voss, whose "Luise," he says, had lately afforded him such "unequalled enjoyment," that he could not help inviting his friend also to contemplate and admire it.

"He (Voss) may be, (and will be, perhaps, for after ages), to Germany what Homer and the most perfect of the Greek poets were to their nation. Did he meet with such a reception as they found among their unrivalled fellow-countrymen—were his idyls publicly recited to the people, and his songs sung in popular assemblies, how much might such a teacher accomplish! He would effect more that was really good and great than *the only true philosophy*, should that ever be discovered. I should like to prescribe Voss and Lessing for you and myself, as our exclusive mental aliment. Voss forbids every author but Lessing, whom he deems perfect, except that he wants rhythm; he did not, indeed, name himself as the second, but no doubt he knows what he is, and would despise the false modesty of refusing to confess it on a fitting occasion. Forsake even Klopstock, and measure yourself by the severe standard of these men; such, at least, is my resolution. Not without reason do I speak thus warmly of 'Luise.' It has done what a book scarcely ever did before—drawn tears of delight from my eyes. It is a striking example, that to move the reader most deeply, the author must be in perfect repose, and the style of his whole work calm and mellowed. We can never sufficiently study and examine this late-born Greek. I, at least, with Homer, Sophocles, Æschylus, Pindar, Horace, and him, would willingly resign all the other poets in the world; yet this is too hastily written—I could not relinquish Theocritus, and that German-Greek Gesner. It will seem strange to you, perhaps even ridiculous, that I should pass over Klopstock. It has cost me much to do so, but if strict justice be done, I fear he will not stand before the Greek tribunal. I must except the most finished of his odes, which Alcæus himself need not blush to acknowledge, were they ascribed to him, and also the 'Republic of the Learned,' a thoroughly German work. But, then, alas! the 'Messiah!' This rigid justice is a sacrifice, and as you know how I reverence this great creator, or rather resuscitator of our literature, you will appreciate it as it deserves. I have sat at his feet, and am at least not ungrateful."—Vol. i. pp. 55, 56.

Hensler, the offer of the post of private secretary to the Danish Minister, Count Schimmelman. His friends strongly urged him to accept the offer, and, with his father's consent, he did so, although for a limited period, that he might afterwards be at liberty to pursue his studies abroad. Before entering upon his duties, he spent some weeks with his parents at Meldorf, accompanied by his friend Moltke, and, while there, paid a visit to Dr. Behrens, the prefect of North Ditmarsh, and the father of his friend Madame Hensler. Here he renewed his acquaintance with Madame Hensler's younger sister, to whom he had been already introduced, and, becoming deeply impressed with her nobleness and worth, yielded to the first impulse of that attachment in which his future happiness was so deeply involved.

His present residence in Copenhagen, which continued till 1798, was not marked by any events of importance. His duties interested him, and no doubt laid the foundation of his future diplomatic attainments; but the distractions attendant on his residence in Count Schimmelman's house were by no means welcome. This led him to accept the office of supernumerary secretary at the Royal Library, with no salary at first, but with permission to travel abroad after a time. In 1797 he returned to Kiel on a visit, and meeting there again, in the house of Dr. Hensler, with Amelia Behrens, his attachment to her ripened into a deep and unconquerable passion. In October of the same year he was betrothed to her—a fact which he announces to his friend Moltke in the following letter:—

"Kiel, October 1797.

"Dora (Madame Hensler) and I send you and your wife this messenger, because we cannot bear to wait several days before writing to you, especially as our letter would be a long time on the road; so you will receive this before another that Dora wrote to you two days ago, which announced as close at hand what has now really taken place. I am in far too great an agitation to say much. Each of you take one of our letters; Dora's will tell you the most. Yesterday evening, at Dora's house, Amelia decided in my favour. Her heart had already decided. Love can distinguish between truth and pretence. She assumed no girlish affectation when Dora gave words to feelings that had before scarcely expressed themselves, and joined our hands. This pure simplicity, this Roman decision in a gentle heart, made my happiness perfect. . . . I know that I have earnestly endeavoured not to deceive Milly. In our conversations when we met, I spoke to her from my inmost heart, and took pains to discover to her what, if concealed, might have deceived her, and made her very unhappy hereafter; for I thought myself bound not to deny what still clings to me from former evil times, as a stain

In 1796 Niebuhr received, through Dr.

to be washed out; but I hope to God that happiness, and the power of love, this new unknown force, and, above all, the contemplation of the proud joy in her angelic heart, and an openness that will rather gain than lose through absence, will purify me before we can be united—for absence is before us."

In the close of the same letter he thus characteristically describes his betrothed:—

"Milly has a Roman character, and this was always my idea of a citizen's wife; pride, intellect, the most retiring modesty, unbounded love, constancy, and gentleness. In history we only meet with such women among the Roman matrons,—the Calpurnias, Portias, Arrias. Soft, weak, tender girlishness, would neither have elevated nor strengthened my character."—Pp. 68–70.

At this period Niebuhr's favourite wish was a professorship at Kiel, where he hoped to lead a quiet and studious life suited to his disposition. It cannot be doubted, on a review of his career, that such a situation was the one for which he was above all others fitted, and where his highest happiness would have been found. His experience subsequently, both in Berlin and Bonn, amply establish this. When we think of what we owe to these comparatively brief spaces of his life devoted to the quiet pursuit of the studies so dear to him, we are strongly inclined to lament the circumstances which turned him from the realization of his early wish. The following letter, dated 24th August 1797, expresses his lofty sense of the qualifications requisite for such a professorship as that which he now contemplated:—

"In order fully to understand and to give lectures upon ancient literature, and ancient history, which forms a part of it, it is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary that I should have read through all the ancient writings still extant, at least once, with the closest attention—the more important works many times—and acquired a living and familiar acquaintance with each period. There may possibly be some exceptions to this rule in the case of special sciences, which must for ever remain a mystery to the uninitiated. This undertaking was carried out by Milton long ago. There would scarcely be found many to do it now, but it seems to me that it is what I undoubtedly ought to attempt.

"A profound and practical acquaintance with the grammar of the two classical languages must be obtained, partly by means of the various treatises on that subject, and partly from the literature of the languages themselves. A systematic philosophy, as the groundwork of all settled convictions and all accurate thought: what is perhaps still more important, method in thinking, writing, and studying; added to these, various exercises in the art of composition, and a thorough command of our mother-tongue, are indispensable requisites for any one who steps

forth before the public, and seeks to obtain a high standing. It is no more than a man demands of himself;

"These, then, are the preliminary tasks that I should have to execute, before I could accept a professorship in Kiel without a blush, and discharge its duties without disgracing or overworking myself."—Vol. i. p. 82.

In June 1798 Niebuhr set out to spend some time of study and travel in England and Scotland. In his letters to his betrothed we have an interesting though imperfect record of his views and impressions during this period. They are marked by considerable acuteness of observation, and touch often, with a very keen probe, some traits of our national character; but they are often also one-sided and exaggerated. His father's name introduced him largely into society, but there were obviously some aspects of our social life of which he saw nothing, or at any rate understood little. He found little to interest him in the mere external appearance of London. A dinner at the Royal Society he characterizes, as "a feast, and the conversation extremely indifferent." Of the style of conversation generally he says: "The superficiality and insipidity of nearly all the conversations to which I have listened, or in which I have joined, is really depressing. As far as I hear, little is said about politics, which is a good thing—much better than our German mania for going beyond our depth on such subjects; but that narrative and commonplaces form the whole staple of conversation, from which all philosophy is excluded,—that enthusiasm and loftiness of expression are entirely wanting, depresses me more than any personal neglect of which, as a stranger, I might have to complain." He finds "mediocrity very common, and by no means looked down upon," and thinks that "the most learned men here, as elsewhere, look more to the authority that a man brings with him than to his talents or intellect." For English scholarship he has little regard. The libraries were naturally his chief sources of interest. "Vauxhall, Ranelagh, Astley's, the Royal Circus, &c., &c., were scarcely worth the money and the time." St. Paul's did not draw from him any expression of admiration; and, while looking with reverence and gratitude on the busts of so many great men in Westminster Abbey, he could not help adding, "How characteristic is the equally honourable position accorded to so many nameless and insignificant persons by the side of the noblest dead! What a quantity of nonsense is to be seen on these venerable walls! One man writes a Hebrew inscription on the tomb of his daughter; on another, I think also belonging to a woman,

there is an Abyssinian inscription; Chatham has an absurdly overburdened allegorical monument; Sidney and Russell have none at all; and on Milton's, the man who erected it gives his own name and title in several lines—Milton is mentioned in the quietest manner."

On his arrival in Edinburgh he entered the University as a student, and the experience of his first day's attendance upon the introductory lectures leaves him convinced beyond all doubt that the reputation of the University was fully deserved, and that the professors were all he could wish, "as men of profound insight, thorough mastery over their subject, and admirable delivery." He found Edinburgh incredibly cheap in comparison with London—cheaper even than Copenhagen. Fashion did not restrict as in London. "The natives of every class were distinguishable, not to their advantage, by the carelessness of their attire, and the students as far removed from English neatness" as young Germany. He describes very pleasantly his intercourse with the family of an old friend of his father's—Francis Scott. He is particularly struck with "the piety of the Scotch." "They not only go to church every Sunday, but to both the services; and all, high and low, conclude the day of rest with prayer and singing." He alludes more than once to this feature of the national character in a way that shows his respect for it, although at the same time betraying his inability to sympathize with it. He does not think highly of our philosophical talent. The praise bestowed upon it by Jacobi he considers undeserved. Among the students especially he found the French materialistic philosophy prevailing. It is interesting to remark what he says of the characteristic idea entertained of his countrymen:—

"Formerly," he observes, "our learned men were regarded as very slow, narrow-minded fellows; now people are inclined to pronounce them very clever men, but to look upon them as so many conspirators against the peace of the world; an opinion that is adopted, in a still more incomprehensible manner, by some young profligates, and excites their delight as much as it does the abhorrence of other people. One of these asked me with great astonishment, 'Are you speaking earnestly? We thought that the German men of letters were without exception atheists, and we admire you on that account.'"

It is also very curious to observe how his German *Innigkeit* (heartiness) felt itself on all sides painfully restrained by our social conventionalism. His many remarks on this subject are pointed with a good deal of sharp truth, although here, as often, he runs into extravagance.

He tarried in Edinburgh altogether less than a year; and after a short excursion into East Lothian, (not having been able to carry into effect his intention of visiting the Highlands,) he returned to Holstein, and spent the winter of 1799–1800 there with his friends. In April he set out for Copenhagen, where he received a warm welcome from Schimmelmann; and a few weeks after his arrival was appointed assessor at the Board of Trade for the East India department, and secretary and head clerk of the Standing Commission of the affairs of Barbary, with a small salary. A professorship was still in his thoughts; but when in the autumn of this year it was eventually offered him, he decided in the meantime for public life. In May he returned to Holstein, and married. In a letter to Madame Hensler, written in the following August, he describes in the most glowing terms his happiness. "Happiness," he says, "is a poor word; find a better."

He intended at this time to devote his leisure hours to German history, but his studies were interrupted, first, by the ill health of his wife, and then by the threatening aspect of affairs in the Danish capital. Amid all the distractions of his present position, however, he continued to prosecute his studies in one form or another. He studied Arabic, and began a treatise on the Roman laws of property and the history of the agrarian laws, in which he appears to have started the clue of some of his subsequent investigations into Roman history.

In 1804 he was appointed first director of the bank, and, practically, the only acting member of the directory. He also became a member of the Standing Commission for the affairs of Barbary, of which he had hitherto acted as secretary. These changes, of course, very much improved his standing and income.

Towards the end of 1805 overtures were made to him by the Prussian Government. After some delay and negotiation he acceded to these overtures, although with considerable reluctance. A heart so warmly affectionate as Niebuhr's felt deeply the separation from his many friends in Denmark. The fearful struggle, too, at this time obviously impending over Prussia, did not help to lighten the prospect before him. Still, having fairly embarked on a political career, he naturally sought a wider field and a higher reward for his conspicuous talents.

He arrived at Berlin on the 5th of October, 1806. The disasters of the Prussian army at Jena, Auerstadt, and Halle, &c., immediately followed his arrival. The victorious French were advancing on Berlin. In the consternation of the moment, the

Prussian authorities surrendered one after another. Many of the ministers, even, yielding to the panic, took the oath of fidelity to the French Commissioners without communication with the King. Stein formed a noble exception, and, under his direction, Niebuhr set out to Stettin with the money belonging to the various offices under his charge. From Stettin he continued his journey to Dantzic. The surrender of the latter town in a few days rendered necessary a retreat to Königsberg, and the continued advance of the army finally compelled him to take refuge in Memel, whither the Royal family had gone, followed by the remanent members of the Government, and the treasury chests.

Stein having received his dismissal from the Prussian monarch, Niebuhr was resolved to send in his resignation also; and for some time he remained undecided as to his future career. He was ultimately induced, however, to remain at his post, in the prospect of Count Hardenberg, or even Baron von Stein, being recalled to office. On the former being entrusted with the portfolio of Foreign Affairs, in 1807, he called Niebuhr to his assistance, and set him at the head of the financial department of the Commissariat. Leaving his wife ill at Memel, he repaired to head-quarters at Bartenstein. The hardship and anxiety, which had already prostrated the weaker health of his wife, now overcame himself. He was attacked with typhus fever, and remained for some time in great danger. Want of attention, and the depression arising from his utter loneliness, prolonged his illness. His deep dejection betrays itself in his letters to his wife. Amid the harassing hardships of the public life in which he was engaged he looks back, with a fond regret on his historical studies. "I belong to those," he says, "who must have freedom for the soul and intellect; and for this very reason I ought not to have entered on the restraints of official life. I am often seized with regret when I think of my beautiful researches into history; my happy meditations on dark periods; my power of bringing them vividly before my mind's eye; my life in antiquity. Where is all this gone? Shall I ever renew it? Shall I ever be able to restore it to fresh life?"

Continued disasters compelled the retreat of the Prussian Government still northwards; and in July 1807 we find Niebuhr in Riga, in great anxiety and uncertainty. "We cannot describe our grief," he writes to Madame Hensler, "for our expressions might be watched in several quarters; we have often expressed them to you before,

and now we have nothing but helpless wishes. Oh that the storm might disperse, that we might meet once more on the undesecrated, uninjured soil of our fatherland!" Yet amid all the anxious toil and sorrow which now preyed upon him, we find him unflagging in his studies. He avails himself of the opportunity to study the Russian and Slavonic languages, and earnestly defends his endeavour to do so in a letter to Madame Hensler, who would seem to have remonstrated with him on what she conceived an unnecessary diversion of his time.

On the 12th of July tidings reached Riga that peace was concluded. So painfully discouraged was Niebuhr by the acknowledged subjection of his country, that he sent a request for his dismissal to one of his colleagues, to be transmitted to the king. His Majesty, however, having expressed himself reluctant to part with his services, he was induced to continue them, and to comply with the Royal request to repair to Memel. Stein having returned to office, he employed Niebuhr to conduct a difficult negotiation with the Dutch capitalists for a loan; and with this view he set out, after a brief visit to his friends in Denmark, (having been met in Berlin by the intelligence of the death of his mother,) with his wife to Amsterdam. Great difficulties having occurred in the negotiation, Niebuhr was instructed to remain at Amsterdam; and in July 1808 was formally accredited as Prussian Minister at the Court of Holland.

Meanwhile, Stein, discovered in his patriotic project for the deliverance of Germany, was proscribed by Napoleon; and in the confusion resulting from the change of Government, Niebuhr sought a quiet refuge for a little with his relatives in Ditmarsh. Here he spent the greater part of the summer of 1809, but was at length summoned to Königsberg, where the Court and Government were still resident, to resume his public duties. During this renewed period of official activity, under Count Altenstein, his health again gave way, and he fell into a still deeper dejection than before, in the contemplation of his country's wrongs and sufferings. Placed, however, at the head of the department for the management of the national debt and the monetary institutions, his incessant employment served, in some degree, to dissipate his gloomy thoughts.

On the resignation of the Altenstein ministry, and the accession of Count Hardenberg to office, Niebuhr, distrusting the latter and dissenting from his principles of administration, requested his Majesty to release him from his post, and give him an appointment in the University about to be opened

in Berlin. After some delay, his request was acceded to, and he was appointed historiographer in place of Johannes von Müller, on the condition, however, that he should assist Count Hardenberg and the Minister of Finance with his opinions and advice when required.

His letters during this period of his life, of which we have presented so slight a summary, are full of interest. They have, however, less purely literary attraction than those of the previous and later periods of his life—the continual vicissitudes and occupations of his official position having left him but little leisure for those studies to which his heart so closely clung. Expressions of mournful bitterness as to his fate in this respect occasionally escape him. “I feel,” he says in a letter to Madame Hensler, “very seriously, and even depressingly, the effects of the last three years, during which my life has been constantly unsettled, and my movements determined by others. Such a life has no inward vitality; it is like a flower plucked from its parent stem—it fades, and leaves no seed behind.” “Instead of poetry, archaeology, and ancient history,” he writes to Moltke, “I have had to cultivate finance, banking, administration—all of which between ourselves are—(compared to my brave old comrades)—a set of beggarly fellows that sometimes almost drive me mad, especially when anything reminds me strongly of all those whom I have lost.”

Niebuhr, now in his 34th year, entered for a short time upon those academic duties, for which there can exist no doubt he was singularly qualified. During all the hardships and changes of his public life we have seen that his heart was still in his early philological and historical studies. That it was truly in this field his special destination and his highest labour and honours lay, is very evident from the following sketch of work he had prescribed for himself in it before this period. There can be no doubt that this is no mere note of vague projects never seriously contemplated, but that his mind had actually pondered and mastered most of the subjects indicated.

Works which I have to complete—

1. Treatise on Roman Domains.
2. Translation of El Wakidi.
3. History of Macedon.
4. Account of the Roman Constitution at its various epochs.
5. History of the Achæan Confederation, of the Wars of the Confederates, and of the Civil Wars of Marius and Sylla.
6. Constitutions of the Greek States.
7. Empire of the Caliphs.

The University of Berlin was opened in 1810. The most illustrious names of Germany in all departments of knowledge were associated with it—Schleiermacher, Savigny, Buttman, and Heindorf. Niebuhr's post did not necessarily attach him to the University; but, at the suggestion of his friend Spalding, he resolved to give a course of lectures on Roman History, in connexion with it. These lectures formed the foundation of his great historical work. In the beginning of September he writes to Madame Hensler:—

“I have determined to give a course of lectures on the History of Rome. I would never have undertaken to write the history of Rome, but to lecture on it is a somewhat less rash undertaking. I shall begin with the primitive state of Italy, and, as far as possible, represent the ancient races, not only from the narrow point of view of their subjugation, but also as they were in themselves, and as they had been in their earlier stages; then, in the Roman history, I shall give an account of the constitution and administration, of which I have a vivid picture before my mind's eye. I should like to bring this history down to the latest era, when the forms developed from the germs of antiquity became utterly extinct, and those of the middle ages took their place.”—Vol. i. pp. 302, 303.

The success of Niebuhr's lectures was remarkable: “In addition to a large audience of students, they were attended by members of the Academy, Professors of the University, public men, and officers of all grades, who spread the fame of the lectures abroad, and thus continually attracted fresh hearers.” He was very powerfully affected by these signs of his success. The interest he had previously felt in his subject was greatly heightened by the warm appreciation of his labours, and his daily familiar intercourse with distinguished scholars. Savigny thus speaks of his delivery: “He had written down his lecture *verbatim*, and read it off before his hearers. This proceeding, which usually injures the liveliness of the impression, had, in his case, the most animated and powerful effect, such as in general only accompanies an extempore delivery. His hearers felt as if transported into ancient times, when the public reading of new books supplied the place of our printed books, and there was a less extended circulation, but they made a warmer and more personal impression.” Savigny was one of those scholars to whom Niebuhr considered himself in the highest degree indebted for sympathy and co-operation in his peculiar studies: he acknowledges his obligations to him in the preface to his History;

and, in a note, speaks of him with the highest respect and admiration.

There can be little doubt, we think, that this period of Niebuhr's residence in Berlin was about the happiest of his life. He was engaged exactly in the task for which Nature had most fitted him; he found rare gratification in the full exercise of his intellectual powers; he was touched and stimulated by the flattering success with which his lectures met; he was surrounded by the most highly gifted and sympathizing society.

"With a little more quiet," he himself writes, "my position would be more completely in accordance with my wishes than I have long ventured even to hope for. There is such a real mutual attachment between my acquaintance and myself, and our respective studies give such an inexhaustible interest to conversation, that I now really possess in this respect what I used to feel the want of. The lectures themselves, too, are inspiring, because they require persevering researches, which I venture to say cannot remain unfruitful to me, and they are more exciting than mere literary labours, because I deliver them with the warmth inspired by fresh thoughts and discoveries, and afterwards converse with those who have heard them, and to whom they are as new as to myself. This makes the lectures a positive delight to me."

To complete the social happiness of his present position, he formed along with Schleiermacher, Buttman, Heindorf, and others, a select Philological Society, which met once a week at the houses of the several members by rotation, for the purpose of reading and correcting some classical author.

About the close of his first series of lectures he put to press the first volume of his History. He thus contemplates the publication:—

"I am now approaching the conclusion of my lectures, and the printing is about to commence. I begin it with a thorough consciousness of what is in my book, and of the rank it will hold at some future day; but I am not quite easy as to its immediate reception, partly because I am aware that the execution might and ought to be improved in many respects; partly because no one is allowed to bring forward novelties before our public with impunity, however clearly their correctness may be proved. Then I have already enjoyed for the most part the reception given to it by affection from Savigny and other friends; that of disapprobation is still to come. *I have written with such strict conscientiousness—not merely with regard to the praise and blame I have dispensed, but also with respect to the historical researches—that I could die on this book.* It certainly will furnish little reading for recreation, and I confess that by the side of many passages successful in point of style, there are others very awk-

ward and stiff. The great merit of this book lies in the criticism of history, and in the light thrown on many insulated points of the constitution, laws," &c.—Vol. i. p. 320.

—A singularly acute and discriminating judgment, as we shall afterwards endeavour to point out.

In 1811 Goethe's Autobiography appeared, and with Niebuhr, as with all interested in German literature, formed a topic of much attraction and talk. Looking forward to it he says,—

"So Goethe's Life is out, and I shall have it in a few days. It always gives me a melancholy feeling when a good man writes his life. It is already evening with him then, and that he relates how he lived, shows that he no longer lives quite from the root."

After its perusal he thus expresses his opinion of it:—

"When it came into my head to say to you that autobiography in general was the song of the swan—and Goethe's no exception—I certainly made too sweeping an assertion. With him, at least, youth has been renewed by the contemplation of his youth; and if he should write nothing like it again, he has written nothing like it for a long time past. The picture of his life is inimitably sweet and graceful. I feel sure that we cannot differ in our judgment of this book. The number of trifles it relates will not annoy you—you will fancy him narrating, and it is the peculiar charm of his style, that you can really feel as if he were telling you the whole. The story of his first love is exquisitely beautiful; no second equal to it can occur in the history, and I should not be sorry if the book were to remain unfinished."—Pp. 325, 326.

In connexion with this criticism it may be interesting to the reader to peruse Goethe's opinion of the first volume of Niebuhr's History. He writes to him on receiving a copy of it,—

"Your discrimination of the poetical from the historical element is of inestimable worth, since by it neither is destroyed, but rather for the first time fully confirmed in its true value and dignity; and there is an inexhaustible interest in seeing how the two again coalesce, and exert a mutual influence. It is much to be wished that all similar phenomena in the history of the world may be treated in the same method. Does it need many words to assure you that I have derived the utmost instruction from your development of the position of the state and of its finances, of its relations to Greece, of the anarchical condition of Rome after the expulsion of the kings; in short, from all and every part? Were I to go into detail, and to speak of your description of Ancus Marcius, of your unveiling of the Sybilline books, or to dwell upon the poems of Lucretia and Coriolanus, I should have to write a book upon

the book, and these sheets would never reach the post. Rest assured that you have sent me a noble gift, for which I shall all my life feel grateful to you; that I am looking forward to the continuation with the greatest eagerness, and, in order to render myself worthy of it, am making your first volume thoroughly my own by the most diligent study."—Vol. i. p. 328.

In the winter of 1811–12 Niebuhr continued his lectures. His audiences were much less numerous than in the preceding winter: still he found stimulus and enjoyment in his work. During the same period he busied himself with the preparation of the second volume of his *History*, which appeared in August 1812. He hoped to go on with the third volume immediately, but overwork having injured his health, he was obliged to abandon his studies altogether for a while; and in the meantime the excitement attending the War of Liberation in Germany, and the new public duties consequently devolving upon him, combined, with the illness and death of his wife, to postpone for a long period the prosecution of his historical studies. Nothing, however, can exceed the enthusiasm with which at this period he dwells upon them. We see how predominantly he was a Student; how all his deepest longings were for a quiet life of intellectual labour; and how much we have really lost by the political distractions which seduced him from his proper field of occupation and duty.

"O! how would philology be divided," he writes to his friend Moltke, August 1812, "if people knew the magical delight of living and moving amidst the most beautiful scenes of the past! The mere reading is the smallest part of it; the great thing is to feel familiar with Greece and Rome during their most widely different periods. I wish to write history with such vividness—so to replace vague by well-defined images—so to disentangle confused representations, that the name of a Greek of the age of Polybius and Thucydides, or that of a Roman in the times of Cato or Tacitus, should instantly call up in the mind the fundamental idea of their character."—Vol. i. pp. 345, 346.

With the spring of 1813 Niebuhr was again actively employed in the political affairs of his country. He was engaged to negotiate with Lord Stewart regarding the subsidies to be advanced by England, and to draw up a commercial treaty between England and Prussia. In the beginning of 1814 we find him in Holland, with the same object of arranging subsidies with the English Commissioners. His journey to Holland at this time had a deeply injurious effect upon the already declining health of Madame Niebuhr. She was able, however,

to accompany him once more on a visit to their friends in Holstein, after which he settled again in Berlin, deeply oppressed by the prospect of the evidently near termination of his domestic happiness and the general aspect of public affairs. In this state he received tidings of the death of his father.

In the spring of 1815 Madame Niebuhr grew rapidly worse, and on the 20th of June she expired in the arms of her husband—one of her parting expressions to him being, "You shall finish your *History* whether I live or die." This loss plunged him in the deepest affliction; and while he never ceased to bear in mind the request of his dying wife, he yet found it impossible in the meantime to resume his labours on Roman history. He turned aside, therefore, to other labours, chiefly of an historical kind. He composed the well-known life of his father—a graphic and interesting biography. He also continued his lessons to the Crown Prince, whom he had begun the year before to instruct in Finance. Of the character of the Prince he gives the most flattering picture:—

"I rejoice," he says, "when the day comes to go to him. He is attentive, inquiring, full of interest—all the noble gifts with which nature has so richly endowed him unfold themselves to me in the course of these lessons. We often wander from our reading into conversation, but not into idle talk, and it is no waste of time. His gaiety of disposition does not render him less earnest; and his feelings are as deep as his fancy is playful. He seeks instruction and counsel from others, without surrendering himself to the authority of any. I have never seen a youth with a finer nature."—Vol. i. p. 416.

Shortly after his wife's death a diplomatic mission to Rome was proposed to Niebuhr, which he considered it to be his duty to accept; and among his other studies he busied himself during the following winter in preparing for it. In July of the next year he set out on his mission, having previously united himself again in marriage to a niece of Madame Hensler. He was accompanied by his friend Professor Brandis, as Secretary of Legation. On his way he visited Munich, and his aged friend Jacobi, as also the patriot Speckbacher, and the memorable scenes of the Tyrolese war. Professor Brandis gives a very interesting account of their interview with the patriot. On the 7th of October he reached Rome. He thus describes his feelings on entering the city in a letter to Madame Hensler:—

"It was with solemn feelings that this morning, from the barren heights of the moory Cam-

pagna, I caught sight first of the cupola of St. Peter's, and then of the view of the city from the bridge, where all the majesty of her buildings and her history seems to lie spread out before the eye of the stranger; and afterwards entered by the Porta del Popolo. I have already wandered through a part of the city, and visited the most famous of the ruins. My presentiment of the emotions with which I should behold them has proved quite correct. Nothing about them is new to me; as a child I lay so often for hours together before the pictures I gave you as a keepsake, that their images were even at that early time, as distinctly impressed upon my mind as if I had actually seen them; then, besides, it repels me that all the remains are those of the imperial times, and it is impossible for an architectural work of art to speak to the feelings, if considered as isolated, and without connexion with other ideas. But the influence of the completely modern part of all that here surrounds you, and intrudes itself upon your attention, is most disturbing; the glaringly bad taste of the churches of the last two hundred and fifty years; the utter want of solemnity in all that meets the eye. In Petrarch's time, all must have made a profound impression of grandeur and magnificence on those who were susceptible to it; indeed, much that had but a short time since spoke to the sense of poetry, has now been destroyed by the clearing out of the rubbish from the Forum and the Colosseum. Now their walls and columns stand stripped and naked, corroded by time, despoiled of the luxuriant and wild vegetation which once flourished among the ruined stones.

"But when one sees this favoured land, to which our most fruitful districts are barren; sees how, at Terni, two harvests of grain are reaped from the soil in one year,—one of wheat in June, and the maize soon after it in October; how this goes on year after year, and the wheat yields fifteen fold; when one sees how there is, strictly speaking, no peasant class at all here; how the very happiest places are those where the peasant only has to give up half the produce, and not where, as for many miles round Rome, all husbandry is performed by day-labourers under the enormously rich nobles; when you see the swarms of beggars who assure you, with looks that bear witness to the assertions, that they have not tasted bread to-day; when you hear what numbers have died of hunger, it does indeed raise bitter feelings. It has become perfectly clear to me how this misery arose in the imperial times, and has been rendered permanent by the German conquerors, who have in no respect made themselves benefactors to Italy."—Vol. ii. pp. 59, 60.

It ought perhaps to be mentioned that there was a famine in the year in which Niebuhr visited Rome, which served greatly to heighten the unfavourable character of his first impression. So grievous was the suffering of the people, that Professor Brandis relates "how, at Venice, they were unable to sleep, from the cries and shrieks of the starving crowds assembled under their windows and calling for bread." Of the moral and

intellectual condition of Rome, however, Niebuhr never changed his strongly unfavourable opinion; and it may be safely doubted whether his characteristic impatience and the sombre tenor of his own thoughts do not somewhat colour the picture which he draws.

"Science," he says, "is utterly extinct here; of philologists there is none worthy of the name except the aged De Rossi, who is near his end. The impossibility of holding any affectionate or interesting intercourse with the natives of this country, is a great obstacle to progress in their language. Another hindrance is, that while all my anticipations regarding the miserable condition of Rome, in a moral point of view, have been fulfilled to the uttermost, I find the difference between the wretched language that is current, and the beautiful old language of the literature, far greater than I had even supposed it to be." "Rome," again, he says, "is a horrible place for any one who is melancholy, because it contains no living present to relieve the sense of sadness—the present is revolting, and in what exists there is not the slightest trace of antiquity to be recognised; there are not even any remains of the Church of the Middle Ages."

Amid so much disappointment with Rome itself, and its inhabitants, he found, however, satisfaction in his friendly reception at the Papal Court, and especially in the society of the German artists, Cornelius, Platner, Overbeck, and the two Schadows, then studying in Rome, and laying the foundation of the present German school of historical painting. With Bunsen also, whom he found in the Papal City, he enjoyed much congenial intercourse: a sympathy of feelings and pursuits soon united them in a very close and permanent friendship.

In April 1817 a son was born to Niebuhr; and already, with that strange enthusiastic hastiness of his, he is speculating about his education.

"The child is full of health; he looks briskly about him, and already begins to take notice. I can handle it very well; and it becomes quiet with me directly.

"I am thinking a great deal about his education. I told you a little while ago, how I intended to teach him the ancient languages very early by practice. I wish the child to believe all that is told him; and I now think you right in an assertion, which I have formerly disputed, that it is better to tell children no tales, but to keep to the poets. But while I shall repeat and read the old poets to him in such a way that he will undoubtedly take the gods and heroes for historical beings, I shall tell him at the same time, that the ancients had only an imperfect knowledge of the true God, and that these gods were overthrown when Christ came into the world. He shall believe in the letter of the Old and New Testaments, and I shall nurture in him from his infancy a firm faith in all that I

have lost, or feel uncertain about. He shall learn to perceive and to observe, and thus grow familiar with nature, and nourish his imagination."—Vol. ii. pp. 101, 102.

The child was baptized by an English clergyman, according to the solemn ritual of the Established Church.

"I was deeply affected," he says, writing to Madame Hensler, "and repeated the vows for my child with my whole heart. Even the Catholics who were present could not help confessing the sublimity of this liturgy. The baptism was followed by a prayer for and with the mother, which is repeated kneeling. I held the child in your name." "He is coming on famously," he adds. "It often gives me a melancholy feeling when, in the evening, he stretches out his arms towards the light, and makes us carry him to the window, where he gazes up into the sky with a fixed bright serious look; often the recollection comes over me of how Milly, too, gazed up into the sky the last time we took her out. I thank Heaven that I can at least shed tears over this remembrance."—Vol. ii. p. 102.

Three daughters were subsequently born to Niebuhr in Rome. But his thoughts and affections continued to circle mainly round his son. Many, and often very touching, are his allusions to him in his correspondence. "His nature is thoroughly good," he writes in 1820, "and his faculties become more and more harmonious as they develop themselves. He has a very quick understanding." And the following extract from a letter to Count Moltke, in 1823, shews how fondly he had watched over his education, and trained him according to the views which he so ardently cherished.

"My Marcus is a boy of excellent capacities; his education amidst antiquity has been perfectly successful. The old world is to him the true and real one; the modern only something accidental. This will undoubtedly render some bitter discoveries necessary in the future. Ancient history and mythology are as familiar to him as to a Roman boy eighteen hundred years ago; and he is burning with sympathy, and sheds tears for the heroes of the Trojan time, over the literal Latin translation of the *Odyssey*, which to us seems so miserable. He looks forward confidently to climbing Parnassus and seeing Jupiter and the old gods there, of whom I told him the modern Greek tradition that they have taken refuge in the summit of the mountain."—Vol. ii. p. 232.

Niebuhr's residence in Rome presents but few facts or features on which we care further to dwell. They do not serve to throw any additional light on his character or the progress of his mental culture. The chief point of interest, and the one which seems to have had the deepest influence on him, is the inti-

mate and happy friendship which he formed with Count de Serre.

"He is one of the rarest and noblest human beings," he says, "that I have ever met with. We have expressed our sentiments to each other with perfect openness respecting all that deeply occupies the intellect of man; about the past and the future, about Germany and France. Nationality is no barrier between us: he is a perfect master of our language, though he prefers talking in French, because I speak it more easily than he does German. He is thoroughly acquainted with our literature; pronounces, for instance, exactly the same verdict as we do upon Goethe's writings at the different periods of his life. While an admirer of his youthful writings, 'Wilhelm Meister,' and others of a similar stamp, are distressing to him. He suits a court about as well as I do, except that having better spirits he more easily adapts himself to every thing. Our political convictions are essentially quite identical."—Vol. ii. pp. 219, 220.

The instructions for the special mission on which Niebuhr had been sent to Rome were delayed from time to time, and only arrived four years after he had taken up his residence there. At length, however, the negotiations with the Papal government were brought to a satisfactory issue. On the completion of this business Niebuhr began to turn his thoughts homeward. The miserable health of Madame Niebuhr was a strong inducement to this; and accordingly he sent a request that he might either be recalled or receive leave of absence. The latter was granted him, and in the summer of 1823 he left Rome, under the strong conviction that he should not revisit it. He returned to Germany leisurely, by way of Florence and St. Gall, at which latter place he spent a few weeks to recruit his health and examine the manuscripts in its celebrated library. At Heidelberg, where were two of his earliest friends, the aged Voss and Thibaut, he also made a brief stay. He then proceeded to Bonn, where he determined to take up his residence until it should be finally decided whether or not he returned to Rome.

Over the remainder of Niebuhr's life we can only linger for a moment. He returned in Bonn to his true vocation, that which, with a sure prescience which perhaps it had been well that he had sooner heeded, had floated before his early vision as the ideal of his life. Although not holding any official appointment in the university, he again began the career of a public instructor. He delivered, from 1825 to 1830, a series of highly important lectures in connexion with the university, chiefly on Roman history, but also on the history of Greece, ancient history, and geography generally. He now

adopted a different manner of delivery from that which characterized his earlier course in Berlin. Instead of the careful and detailed preparation which he had formerly practised, his only preparation now consisted in meditating for a short time on the subject of his lecture, and referring to authorities for his dates. He brought no written notes with him to the lecture-room. We are not surprised to learn that the result of this was a very varying success in imparting his ideas, depending on his physical and mental condition at the moment. Another still more serious consequence is, that we are indebted for all we learn of these later lectures to notes taken by students during their delivery.* While very unequal as a lecturer after this mode, we are assured that a rare and felicitous eloquence—the eloquence “of making the expression the exact reflection of the thought, of embodying each separate idea in an adequate but not redundant form,” not unfrequently characterized him. And this we can very well understand. Familiar as that ancient Life was to him of which he discoursed, and vivid beyond all his powers of expression as were his glimpses of its true meaning, he must have often, in the enthusiasm of the moment, clothed his thoughts in pregnant and graphic forms,—transporting his hearers into the past, with some share of his own delight and rapture. We can also easily understand the affectionate interest which he excited among his pupils. His was exactly that combination of high capacity, simplicity of manner, and bright enthusiasm, so well calculated to win the hearts of students.

His historical labours, apart from his lectures, were chiefly devoted to the revision of the first and second volume of his history, and the preparation of the third volume, which, however, he was destined to leave unpublished. His great aim in the task of revision, to which he gave himself with the most sedulous care, was to express the exact degree of confidence with which he finally regarded his several assertions.

In May 1828, he paid his last visit to Holstein, and spent the summer in the house of Madame Hensler. His time was chiefly passed in happy social intercourse,

and excursions into the beautiful scenery in the neighbourhood of Kiel. “On such occasions Niebuhr was always the centre of a group of children, who had soon discovered the willingness with which he entered into all their amusements, and his inability to refuse them any gratification.”

In 1830, his peace was again violently disturbed. First of all came the personal calamity of the burning down of his new house in the arrangement of which he had taken so much pleasure, and as Professor Brandis remarks, “before order and comfort could be created afresh from the ruins of his domestic existence, the news arrived of the second French Revolution.” The burning of his house in which so many valuable letters and papers were destroyed was naturally felt by him as a great misfortune. The loss, itself, however, was a small matter easily to be borne with; but his fears for its effects on the feeble health of Madame Niebuhr greatly harassed him, and left him, without doubt, more than usually susceptible to gloomy impressions. It was in this mood that he received news of the three days of July,—news which would have powerfully affected him at any time, but which now seem to have embittered and saddened him in no ordinary degree. His intense interest in the course of events may be said to have been indirectly the cause of his death.

“He read the reports in the French journals with eager attention; and as these newspapers were much in request at that time, from the universal interest felt in their contents, he did not in general go to the public reading-room where he was accustomed to see the papers daily, until the evening. On Christmas Eve and the following day, he was in better health and spirits than he had been for a long while, but on the evening of the 25th of December, he spent a considerable time waiting and reading in the hot news-room without taking off his thick fur cloak, and then returned home through the bitter frosty night air, heated in mind and body. Still full of the impressions made on him by the papers, he went straight to Classen’s room, and exclaimed, ‘that is true eloquence! You must read Sauzet’s speech; he alone declares the true state of the case; that this is no question of law, but an open battle between hostile powers! Sauzet must be no common man! But,’ he added immediately, ‘I have taken a severe chill, I must go to bed.’ And from the couch which he then sought, he never rose again, except for one hour, two days afterwards, when he was forced to return to it quickly, with warning symptoms of his approaching end.

* These lectures, in so far as they relate to the course of Roman history from the point where his published history stops, have, it is well known, been collected and translated by Dr. Schmitz. A translation of his lectures on Ancient History generally, some years ago collected and published in Germany, has also just appeared from the same indefatigable pen. As an interpreter of his great countryman, not only directly, but also indirectly, in his own admirable *Manual of Roman History*, the English public are deeply indebted to Dr. Schmitz.

"His illness lasted a week, and was pronounced on the fourth day to be a decided attack of inflammation on the lungs. His hopes sank at first, but rose with his increasing danger and weakness; even on the morning of the last day he said, 'I may still recover.' Two days before, his faithful wife, who had exerted herself beyond her strength in nursing him, fell ill and was obliged to leave him. He then turned his face to the wall, and exclaimed, with the most painful presentiment, 'Hapless house! To lose father and mother at once!' And to the children he said, 'Pray to God, children, He alone can help us!' And his attendants saw that he himself was seeking comfort and strength in silent prayer. But when his hope of life revived, his active and powerful mind soon demanded its wonted occupation. The studies that had been dearest to him through life, remained so in death; his love for them was found to be pure and genuine by its unwavering perseverance to the last. While he was on his sick-bed, Classen read aloud to him for hours the Greek text of the Jewish History of Josephus, and he followed the sense with such ease and attention, that he suggested several emendations in the text at the moment; this may be called an unimportant circumstance, but it always appeared to us one of the most wonderful proofs of his mental powers. The last learned work in which he was able to testify his interest, was the description of Rome by Bunsen and his friends which had just been sent to him; the preface of the first volume was read aloud to him, and called forth expressions of pleasure and approbation. He also asked for light reading to pass the time, but our attempts to satisfy him were unsuccessful. A friend proposed 'Briefe eines Verstorbenen,' which was making a great sensation; but he declined it, saying, that he feared that its levity would jar upon his feelings. One of Cooper's novels was recommended to him, and excited his ridicule by its extraordinary verbiage. He was much amused by trying an experiment he proposed, which consisted in taking one period at hap-hazard on each page, and by the discovery that this mode of reading did little violence to the connexion of the story. The 'Cölnische Zeitung' was read aloud to him up to the last day, with extracts from the French and other journals. He asked for them expressly only twelve hours before his death, and gave his opinion, half in jest, about the change of ministry in Paris. But on the afternoon of the 1st of January 1831, he sank into a dreamy slumber. Once, on awakening, he said that pleasant images floated before him in sleep;

now and then he spoke French in his dreams; probably he felt himself in the presence of his departed friend De Serre. As the night gathered, consciousness gradually faded away; he woke up once more about midnight, when the last remedy was administered; he recognised in it a medicine of doubtful operation, never resorted to but in extreme cases, and said in a faint voice, 'What essential substance is this? Am I so far gone?' These were his last words; he sank back in his pillow, and within an hour his noble heart had ceased to beat."—Vol. ii. pp. 329–332.

If we now endeavour to gather up into a connected view our impressions of the character of Niebuhr, exhibited in these rapid traces of his life, it is certainly a noble and engaging picture that presents itself. A rare simplicity and conscientiousness, a tender and beautiful affectionateness, united with an exquisite polish and culture of understanding, are the characteristics that shine out upon us from the whole course of his career. There is above all a *thoroughness* about him, a genuine frankness and honesty which will brook no disguise. He scorned even with bitterness all approach to affectation of any kind, and his most earnest prayer for his boy was that he might never turn out "a conceited shallow fool, nor a man who is himself contented with superficiality, and assumes an appearance to throw dust in the eyes of others." Certainly no one could ever have cared less for mere appearances than Niebuhr. He was a true German in downright sincerity. His opinions were formed with independence, and held with outspoken earnestness. He was not content to think or speak on any subject at second hand; and he had no conception of cloaking or modifying his sentiments to suit the prejudices or ideas of others. He had, indeed, too little pliability. He was too little open to influences entitled to his consideration. His independence not unfrequently amounted to arrogance towards the views and feelings of others. His character was perhaps altogether too self-centred. This strong egoism, founded as it was upon so rich and ample a scholarship, helped greatly to advance his historical investigations, although it also here led him sometimes into error. It must, we fancy, however, have but little qualified him for many of the subtle and accommodating duties of diplomacy; and, in fact, there is abundant evidence that the diplomatic yoke never sat easily on his impatient and independent spirit. He was not the stuff to make a courtier of in any sense. There is a story told by Bunsen (pp. 42–75,) which very well illustrates

this, but which we cannot afford space to quote.

The thorough truthfulness characteristic of the man was even more conspicuously characteristic of the scholar and the writer. We know nothing, indeed, more noble and exalted than his example here—nothing more impressive than his statement of the principles which, in this respect, ought to animate the student, contained in his famous letter to “a young man who wished to devote himself to philology.” This is altogether a most precious letter,—the most perfect rubric of study we know anywhere to be found; we would have it engraven on the heart of every student. How full of truth and value, for instance, the following:—

“You do not write simply enough to express without pretension a thought that is dear to your mind. That you cannot give richness and soundness to your style is no subject for blame; for though there have been some, especially in former times, who by the particularly fortunate guidance given to a peculiar talent, have been able to do this at your age, such perfection is, as a rule, out of the question. Fullness and maturity of expression presuppose a maturity of soul which can only arrive in the progress of its development. But what we always can and always ought to do, is not to strive after the semblance of more than we can perform, and to think, and express ourselves with straightforwardness and correctness.”—Vol. ii. pp. 225-6.

And again,

“All writing should be nothing but the symbol of the thought and speech.”
“Everything must be based upon thought, and the thought must shape the structure of the language.” “If our thoughts do not satisfy us, if we turn and twist in the consciousness of our poverty, writing will become a horrible labour to us.”—P. 229.

But it is with the earnest manner in which he inculcates truthfulness that we are at present concerned.

“But above all things,” he says, “we must preserve our truthfulness in science so pure, that we must eschew absolutely every false appearance—that we must not write the very smallest thing as certain of which we are not fully convinced—that when we have to affirm a conjecture, we must strenuously endeavour to exhibit the precise degree of probability we attach to it. If we do not ourselves indicate our own errors, where possible, even such as it is unlikely that any one will ever discover—if when we lay down our pen we cannot say in the sight of God, upon strict examination, I have not knowingly written anything that is not true, and have never deceived, either regarding myself, or others; I have not exhibited my most in-

terested opponent in any light which I could not justify upon my death-bed; if we cannot do this, then study and literature render us unrighteous and sinful.”—Pp. 230, 231.

Then, after alluding to his own practice of never quoting at second hand, and remarking, that he would not blame others who are less strict in this respect, supposing that they either mention that their citations are borrowed, or that it is really a matter of indifference to them whether or not people consider them to be more profoundly learned than they truly are, he proceeds to say,—

“But of a young man I require absolutely, and without indulgence, were it only as an exercise of virtue, the most scrupulous truthfulness in literary as in all other matters, that it may become a part of his very nature, or rather that the truthfulness which God has implanted in his nature may remain there. With this weapon alone can we fight our way through the world. The hour in which my Marcus should tell an untruth, or give himself the semblance of a merit that he did not possess, would make me very unhappy; it would be the fall in Paradise.”—P. 232.

Even by those who may consider Niebuhr somewhat rigid in his exactions here, it will not be disputed that there is almost a sublimity about the truthfulness of the man who could thus write. He could not brook that the shadow of a falsehood should rest on any work of his. There was no charm of grace—no drapery of external decoration that could compensate, in his eyes, for the unveiled aspect of truth. Loving poetry from his heart, and possessing a warm and lively sympathy with its beautiful fictions in every age, he yet loved truth better. The pale sparkle of this lustrous gem delighted him more than the brilliancy of the finest invention. And this is the key to all his labours on Roman History. It was not in the least degree a merely destructive zeal that led him to tear off the poetic vesture in which that history had become hidden. It was not because the imaginative picture of Rome's early career had no attractions for him. On the contrary, on every page of his history there is the evidence how deeply it interested him—with what a thorough and genial love he dwelt on it. But it was because he longed to penetrate to the traces of fact that lay concealed beneath the embellishments of the picture. The mere work of sceptical demolition was not in any sense peculiarly his. It did not remain for him to doubt for the first time the historical veracity of the common narrative transmitted by Livy. But his was eminently the merit of discerning the *true* beneath all the distortions of poetic colouring. The ruins

were not made by him; they lay already scattered around. But his it was, for the first time, to seize, in some degree, the outline and form of the ruined and obliterated structure.

While marking a stern truthfulness as among the most prominent characteristics of Niebuhr, it would indeed be a strangely erroneous conclusion to judge him deficient in the warmth and sensibility of genius. His letters everywhere shew him, on the contrary, to be the child of feeling and enthusiasm. The deep tenderness of his nature breaks out in all relations. All the aspects of life especially—all that is lovely, or grand, or touching in human passion or affection, had a living interest for him, and swayed him with a living power. His heart moved in tremulous response to all that is ennobling and beautiful in human character or conduct. His historical intuition was eminently vivid and *poetic*. It was as an animate and shaping picture, in which the forms of ancient Life presented themselves in clear and distinct colouring, that the Past stood before him. And as to his labours on the early Roman History, even in their most negative aspect, what were they but just the analysis and reproduction, in its genuine form, of the poetic element which had become so largely involved in it? Far from discovering any lack of poetic appreciation, it was the very depth and delicacy of this power in him which enabled him to reclaim for Poetry those fine old stories which not even the most tedious and insipid narratives of ancient and modern compilers had succeeded in utterly mutilating and destroying.

There is one point, but indistinctly intimated in our previous detail of Niebuhr's life, which might have claimed from us a somewhat minute and patient consideration—we mean his religious convictions. We had intended to dwell perhaps at some length on this point; but we prefer, upon reflection, to allow him to speak for himself, with but slight comment on our part. The subject is one not to be hastily dealt with, and our space is rapidly drawing to a close.

Niebuhr, as we have already hinted, had but little sympathy with those vague and abstruse speculations so congenial to his countrymen. He seems never for a moment to have lost himself in the region of Transcendental Philosophy. His deep love of reality, and warm sympathy with all the practical interests of human life, saved him from this. He had grown up, however, amid the theological "enlightenment" of the old Rationalism, and although, as he afterwards says, contemplating it with disgust, he yet could not fail to own its influ-

ence in some degree. If in no other respect, he felt its effects in the want of any adequate religious instruction in his youth. It is not much to be wondered at, therefore, if his riper views should bear the trace of this—if a vague uncertainty should still have haunted as its shadow the faith to which his heart clung. His early historical studies, too, did not certainly tend to check the sceptical influences under which he had been educated—but rather the reverse. The following extract from the deeply interesting letter addressed to an anonymous correspondent, may serve to place the measure of his scepticism, and the causes which operated in its production, before the reader:—

"Faith, properly so called, in a much wider sense than religious faith, it is either not given to every nature to possess, or the possibility of its taking root and flourishing may be annihilated by an inharmonious intellectual life. The soil may be fertile, but the climate ungenial. My intellect early took a sceptical direction. With my whole attention bent upon the real and the historical, eager to comprehend and to get to the bottom of everything, I let my thoughts follow the natural association of ideas, without endeavouring to guide them into any particular channel; and in this respect had neither, properly speaking, a truly creative imagination, nor any strong feeling of the need of something beyond the boundaries of experience to satisfy my heart; or perhaps I let both perish for want of nourishment. Altogether, it was very seldom that the consciousness of a thought vanished from my mind in the contemplation of its import and object. To this, unquestionably my natural turn of mind, was added the influence of miserable religious instruction, and of the living study of classical antiquity. Thus it was in riper years, and through the study of history, that I came back for the first time to the sacred books, which I read in a purely critical spirit, and with the purpose of studying their contents as the groundwork of one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of the world. This was not a mood in which real faith could spring up, for it was that of the Protestantism of the present day. I needed no Wolfenbüttel fragments to discover the discrepancies of the Gospels, and the impossibility of even drawing the outlines of a tenable history of the life of Jesus by such criticism. In the Messianic allusions to the Old Testament, I could recognise no prophecies, and could explain all the passages adduced with perfect ease. But here, as in every historical subject, when I contemplated the immeasurable gulf between the narrative and the facts narrated, this disturbed me no further. He, whose earthly life and sorrows were depicted, had for me a perfectly real existence, and his whole history had the same reality, even if it were not related with literal exactness in any single point. Hence also the fundamental fact of miracles, which, according to my conviction, must be conceded, unless we adopt the not merely incomprehensible but absurd hypothesis, that the Holiest was a deceiver,

and his disciples either dupes or liars; and that deceivers had preached a holy religion, in which self-renunciation is everything, and in which there is nothing tending towards the erection of a priestly rule—nothing that can be acceptable to vicious inclinations. As regards a miracle in the strictest sense, it really only requires an unprejudiced and penetrating study of nature, to see that those related are as far as possible from absurdity, and a comparison with legends, or the pretended miracles of other religions, to perceive by what a different spirit they are animated.”—Vol. i. pp. 339, 340.

It will be seen even from this, ample as the confession of unbelief may appear to many, how far Niebuhr was from the desolating naturalism that at this time still held so many minds in Germany. If the purity and simplicity of his faith were marred—if his intellect and his heart were unreconciled on the ground of Scripture—he yet obviously possessed a clear recognition of the divine mission of the Saviour and of the divine power of that faith which he taught. The story of the Life of Jesus seemed to him indeed fragmentary and incomplete; but the Life itself was a reality. The picture was broken and defaced, but there were traces enough of divine harmony and beauty in it. And the Christian convictions of Niebuhr seem to have gathered strength and clearness, as his mind continued to dwell on the facts of the Christian history. Writing from Rome in 1818, two years later than the letter from which we have just quoted, he expresses himself with confidence and earnestness concerning the reality of historical Christianity. The revered Neander was deeply touched with his “golden words,” and hailed them as a signal testimony to the truth “from one of the greatest men of modern times.” “In my opinion,” he says, “he is not a Protestant Christian who does not receive the historical facts of Christ’s earthly life in their literal acceptance, with all its miracles as equally authentic with any event recorded in history, and whose belief in them is not as firm and tranquil as his belief in the latter; who has not the most absolute faith in the articles of the Apostle’s creed, taken in their grammatical sense; who does not consider every doctrine and every precept of the New Testament as undoubted divine revelation in the sense of the Christians of the first century, who knew nothing of a theopneustia. Moreover, a Christianity after the fashion of the modern philosophers and Pantheists, without a personal God, without immortality, without human individuality, without historical faith, is no Christianity at all to me; though it may be a very intellectual, very ingenious philosophy. I have often said that I do not

know what to do with a metaphysical God, and that I will have none but the God of the Bible, who is heart to heart with us.”

We will only say further on this matter, that whatever may have been defective in Niebuhr’s theoretical views of Christianity, his life shews not feebly the beautiful traces of Christian virtue. In the numerous and varied letters of these volumes, the man stands before us in the full breadth and depth of his inner being; and it would not be easy to match the moral purity and integrity of the picture presented to us. It is no mere hard and featureless stoicism we contemplate, no mere Pagan rectitude; but the lines of the portrait are stamped with the deep and pervasive energy of Righteousness, and softened and graced by the gentle touch of Charity. If his intellect may have halted in the acknowledgment of the whole truth, there is evidence that his heart and temper had bowed to that divine might which can alone remould in “the beauty of holiness” the degraded vessel of our fallen humanity. From the depths of his soul, we believe, did he feel the import and the value of the prayer to which he gives utterance in the same letter from Rome. “O that men strove in simplicity of heart, and in union with those like-minded to themselves, to attain true fruit-bearing faith, piety, and love.”

If we now venture to express, in conclusion, our brief estimate of Niebuhr’s position and work as an Historian, it is with no pretensions to decide with any authority on either. We are too conscious of the difficulty of the task. Only in a review of his life, some remarks on its chief labour would seem to be necessary.

We have already sufficiently indicated our conception of Niebuhr’s historical work as in the highest degree constructive, and not in any sense merely of a negative and sceptical character. He did indeed overthrow, but it was ever only with the view of reaching to the basis of truth beneath. He had no love for the process of destruction in itself. If necessarily so much engaged in clearing away, it was only that he might penetrate to the actual shape of the fabric, concealed and encumbered by the parasitic growth of centuries. The task to which Niebuhr set himself, was beyond all question the positive one of reconstructing the *history* of Rome from the legendary narrative with which it has become so mixed up and identified. This was his aim, whatever may be thought of his success.

And to this great work it cannot be doubted he brought consummate powers. It was not merely the vastness of his learning:

it was above all, the depth and range of his historical vision. His implements of investigation were not merely of the highest power and the keenest edge, but he had that gift of *sight* into antiquity, which no mere amount of learned accoutrements can ever impart. He had the eye to see and understand the Past as no one before him had done. And this natural power of insight he had trained with the most assiduous culture. For years his gaze had dwelt with "ever renewed, undeviating steadfastness" on the confused and blended picture, till, as he himself finely says, he had seen "the history of mistaken, misrepresented, and forgotten events, rise out of mists and darkness, and assume substance and shape, as the scarcely visible aerial form of the nymph in the Slavonian tale, takes the body of an earthly maiden beneath the yearning gaze of love."* It was this genuine love of the old classical Life not only in its outward and more accidental aspects, its circumstantial history—which was all really that had as yet engaged the attention of the modern historian; but in its inward organic development, its essentially characteristic features, which especially distinguished Niebuhr. He comprehended for the first time adequately the varied interest and import of that Life—its full depth and consistency; and sought to develop and explain the different forms in which it expressed itself. Many had before brought ample learning and ability to the task of writing ancient history, but none had as yet entered as he did into the Life of the ancient people, or endeavoured to trace as he did, the rise and development of those institutions in which it was once exhibited and restrained. No one had as yet aimed to reproduce the past in its deeper national significance—in all the variety of its social and political phases; and no higher praise can well be bestowed upon Niebuhr, than that he was the first clearly to grasp this conception of history, however imperfectly he may have realized it.

Of his realization of the work which he had so well conceived, there cannot well, we think, be any difference of opinion. It is undoubtedly in a great degree imperfect. With so rich and vivid an historical intuition, he was yet greatly deficient in the artistic skill of representation. He could *see* for himself, but he had not the craft to work out his vision in an efficient and interesting form for others. There is not a reader we are sure out of a hundred, who does not find with all his best endeavours, that it is a hard task to read Niebuhr's history. He has so

accumulated on his pages the materials of his investigations—he at once buries the reader with himself in such a mass of circumstantialities, that it requires a vision similar to his own—a similar familiarity with antiquity—to thread one's way among them, and catch the line of his exposition or narrative. In so far there can be no doubt that Niebuhr mistook the function of the Historian. All throughout his work, including his third volume, for which Arnold claimed more of the character of genuine history, it is rather as the dissertator upon history, than the actual Historian, that he appears. And we have seen that he himself was not insensible to this predominantly expository and critical character of his labours. His style, too, is, as a whole, laboriously Teutonic in its structure, abounding often to very weariness with exceptive clauses, although often, also, it must be admitted, rich and solid in the compass and vigour of its expressions. He sets at times, by a few ripe and felicitous touches, a full and rich picture before the reader; but his general narrative is wholly wanting in pictorial skill and animation. It is always the heavy and didactic march of the essayist, rather than the rapid and flexible movement of the narrator. Much of all this was, no doubt, owing to the nature of the subject, where he had not only to describe the course of facts according to his own conception, but ever to clear away before him the misrepresentations with which it had been encumbered. But then it is just because this process of clearance is constantly so obvious on his pages,—because he gives us not only the results, but also the details of his investigations, and often in so minute and crowded a manner, that we must pronounce Niebuhr deficient in historical art, and that his great work must be regarded more as a rich quarry from which others may build the finished structure, than in any sense such a structure itself.

Niebuhr's great merit, however, remains as in some sense the author of that new conception of history which regards the whole Life of a people in its social and constitutional development. This conception was no doubt one rising upon the age, and making itself therefore more or less consciously intelligible to many minds; but there were none who as yet had so clearly grasped and applied it as Niebuhr did in relation to the Roman people. That he was not able to realize with artistic effect his own conception, is perhaps not to be wondered at. It is not always given to the same minds at once to divine and to execute. Others rise to carry out in the most successful practical form, the teeming idea which its

* History, vol. ii. p. 14.

own author so vividly felt, but did not adequately realize. But the man to whom it is given first clearly to express or render intelligible such an *Idea*, is a master man in his time, and even by those who may least acknowledge his teaching, his influence must be felt through many generations. It is in this way, we believe, that the greatness of Niebuhr's historical labours is most attested. It is not the actual amount of historical truth that they have added to our knowledge, but it is the impulse they communicated to historical criticism, on a penetrative and comprehensive principle hitherto unknown, which makes them mark an era. The special worth of many of his conclusions in Roman history may be disputed, but the searching character of his historical method, and the deeper and more exhaustive range he vindicated for historical inquiry, will bear fruit, as it has already amply done, in the more picturesque and life-like pages of many future historians.

ART. VI.—1. *The Archaeology and Prehistoric Annals of Scotland.* By DANIEL WILSON, Honorary Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Edinburgh, 1851.*

2. *The Primeval Antiquities of Denmark.* By J. J. A. WORSAAE, &c., &c. Translated and applied to the illustration of similar Remains in England, by W. T. THOMAS, F. S. A. Oxford, 1849.

3. *Vestiges of the Gael in Gwynedd.* By the Rev. W. B. JONES, M. A., Fellow of Queen's College, Oxford. London, 1851.

4. *Remains of Pagan Saxondom, principally from Tumuli in England.* By JOHN YONGE AKERMAN, Fellow and Secretary of the Society of Antiquaries of London. Part I.

THE study of antiquities has frequently, and in many cases by no means unjustly, served as a laughing-stock to not a few who would willingly acknowledge that, when treated as it is in the works whose titles we have just transcribed, it can afford no just matter for ridicule, except to those by whom any pursuit not directly subservient to present wealth and comfort is at once dismissed with scorn. It is indeed but very recently that antiquarian research has assumed a character which could fairly put it out of the

reach of well-merited contempt. Just now, indeed, the present race of archæologists possibly treat their predecessors with too little reverence; certain it is that, to a genuine disciple of the new school, few sorts of reading afford such unalloyed amusement as the great bulk of works bequeathed to him by his precursors even of the last generation. From dull plodding on the one hand, and wild speculation on the other, Archæology has assumed the character of a science; results are combined, and inferences deduced, according to the rules of logic and the laws of evidence; and the new science holds out her hand to those which have been recognised before her, though we hear some not unreasonable complaints that she has been sometimes a little scurvily treated by her elder sisters.

Such at least is the opinion of the learned author of the first work on our list, which, as having more direct claims upon a *North British Review*, we mean more fully to review in a stricter sense, employing the others chiefly in drawing out a connected statement of the most important results of primeval archæological study up to the present time. The reputation of Mr. Worsaae's work is already made, and it has taken its place as a text-book on the subject. Mr. Jones' treatise has a more limited sphere, and is perhaps hardly archæological in the very strictest sense; his inquiry is immediately confined to the population of a small corner of our island, but his view, if found correct, is in close connection with a most important fact in the general ethnology of the three kingdoms.

Of Dr. Wilson's volume, which we owe an apology to our readers for not noticing sooner, our opinion in brief would be, that he has shown himself thoroughly master of his subject, but that he has hardly shown himself equally master of the art of writing a book about it. No one can study his work without recognizing the results of most unwearied research, combined with a good acquaintance with the general laws of historical evidence, and skill in applying some of the principles of inductive argument to the materials before him. A remarkably strong vein of common sense runs through the whole composition. His style of writing is, with a few exceptions, pure and unaffected, and an occasional stroke of sly satire is, for the most part, very skillfully managed. On the whole, the work is a very valuable contribution to English literature in the department to which it relates.

One great object of Dr. Wilson's book is to connect simple archæology, meaning hereby the study of man's artificial works,

* Since this work was published the author has worthily received the honorary degree of LL.D. from the University of St. Andrews.

from bone fish-hooks to Gothic cathedrals, with what are really its kindred studies; with geology on the one hand, with social and political history on the other. The connexion of archaeology and geology he has treated in an exceedingly able manner; we have seldom read anything more striking than the chapters in which he depicts the intrusion of the earliest Allophylian race upon the domain of wild beasts, some species of which now exist only in a fossil state. With the other side of his task Dr. Wilson is, we think, less successful. It has struck us more than once, that he fails in that broad grasp of general history which is so desirable in a work of this kind, and that he has no very deep acquaintance with classical antiquity. When he gets on this last field he sometimes commits mistakes, and never seems quite at home.*

We cannot extend our commendation so unreservedly to the arrangement of the work as to the matter. There is a lack of real systematic method; information is frequent-

* Thus in quoting Festus Avienus (p. 195.) he misdates that author eight centuries, placing him b. c. 400, instead of A. D. In p. 198 we are told that the *Phenicians* colonized Marseilles, which we may charitably conclude is a misprint for Phœceans. In p. 547—to turn to a piece of Teutonic antiquity—we find the famous ode on Æthelstan's victory so translated as to represent the "grey deer" as among the animals to whom the carcasses of Scot and Northman were assigned as a prey. Here the philological difficulty vanishes before the zoological: has Dr. Wilson any ground for believing that so important a change in the diet of the Ruminantia has taken place within so comparatively recent a period? Hardly less difficulty should we have in believing that "some small flint-flakes and arrow-heads, gathered on the elevated mound of the tomb of the Platæans at Marathon," were "weapons used by the Greek patriots in repelling the Persian invader." Now every one who has read either Æschylus or Byron, to say nothing of Herodotus or Thirlwall, is pretty well acquainted with the fact that the bow was the Persian, the spear the Grecian weapon, and, as Herodotus distinctly mentions (iii. 69) tribes with arrow and javelin heads of stone and bone among the followers of Xerxes, we may easily conceive warriors with similar equipments to have swelled those of Datis and Artaphernes. With one or two exceptions, Dr. Wilson's mistakes, arising from this source, do not bear upon the immediate subject of Scottish Archaeology, and, consequently, do not greatly detract from the direct value and authority of his book, but they are blemishes in a work of this character which we should be glad to see corrected in the next edition. One, and that among the most singular of all, does seem to affect his main argument. A good deal of his reasoning as to the comparative antiquity of the use of different metals in different parts of Europe, turns upon the dates of the earliest barbaric irruptions into the Roman territory. Now, after diligently examining Dr. Wilson's statements (in p. 351.) we cannot avoid the conclusion, that he believes that the capture of Rome by Brennus took place "circa b. c. 113—100," so that Camillus and Marius encountered, we must suppose, different divisions of the same army.

ly found in an earlier or later stage of the book than the table of contents would have led us to expect. Again, while one chief object of the book is to connect archaeology with ethnology, and while no one is more skilful in applying archaeological facts to prove ethnological conclusions, the author nowhere gives his ethnological system in a connected form, but leaves his readers to patch it up how they may, from various statements and allusions scattered up and down the volume.

Moreover, he does not seem to have thoroughly grasped the wide distinction between a paper in publications like the *Archæological Journal*, and a formal and standard treatise on a general subject of archaeology. The former is of course a mere occasional composition, descriptive of some individual object or class of objects, mere "*mémoires pour servir*," in which the minuter the description of every object, and everything relating to it, the better. But in a volume like Dr. Wilson's we want results, we want some general view, to which the individual examples should serve merely as illustrations. This Mr. Worsaae has seen and acted upon with his usual clearness and method. But Dr. Wilson gives us long stories about individual swords, tombs, or bracelets, and often leaves us to find out the general view to which they subserve from mere scattered allusions. Nothing is more perplexing to a reader than this confusion of the theorem and the demonstration; but though Dr. Wilson carries it to a greater length than any writer whom we have come across for some time, we must confess that he sins in good company; it is the fault of the immortal work of Niebuhr.*

But we will pass from the unpleasant task of fault-finding, which we have performed from a sense of the great importance of the book, and a desire that it should be as nearly as possible free from defects which might diminish its value as a standard work in this department of literature. We should like to see Dr. Wilson recast his work in a more portable form, correct his occasional positive mistakes, and introduce more order and system. As a contribution to the latter object,

* Dr. Wilson sometimes uses terms in a loose way, so that it is not easy to reach his real meaning. This is peculiarly the case with the compound terms of Ethnology. His application to one of the three primeval periods of the Scandinavian antiquaries, of the *alias* "Teutonic or Iron," involves an ethnological position which he neither proves nor distinctly states. In this respect Dr. Wilson contrasts unfavourably with Mr. Worsaae, who is the very personification of clearness and method. His arguments may not invariably bring conviction, but there can never be any doubt as to what his opinions really are.

we will now endeavour to put together the results of our study of the works at the head of this article, in the course of which we hope to shew, that although we have noted some points in Dr. Wilson's volume which require amendment, it contains very much which we deeply appreciate and admire.

By Primeval Archaeology, in its more extended sense, we understand a science which endeavours, from internal evidence, to throw light on the condition of a country and its inhabitants in periods anterior to history. It seeks, from an investigation of whatever traces they have left behind them, to ascertain who were the inhabitants, and what was their amount of civilisation, in ages when no written records existed. From an examination of their weapons, their utensils, their sepulchres, and, above all, their skulls, it would reconstruct a picture of a state of things on which written history, and even tradition itself, is silent. Such a process of course cannot recover the names and actions of individuals, or, in many cases, even of nations, nor can it fix any other than an approximate and comparative date to the events which it rescues from oblivion, yet it can often establish the chronological succession, though not the duration, of various races in the same country, and can throw much light upon their social condition, their habits, and even their religious belief. Such a work requires no small powers and no small judgment; it can only be carried on by a sound process of induction from phenomena, equally opposed to the mere lifeless accumulation of facts, and to that spirit of insane speculation which has built up so many beautiful theories, which unfortunately have often not a solitary fact to stand upon. This line of investigation is that which is followed by all our authors; and we think that an attentive study of their works might have caused a recent historian, equally admirable in his own department, to have abstained from a somewhat flippant and uncalled for denunciation of pre-historic studies altogether.*

To accomplish this end it is necessary to inquire into a great many objects whose first aspect is far from interesting, and which only derive any charm or value from their connexion with other and higher pursuits. Certainly a mind which can delight in the investigation of old heaps of stones, broken pots, and flakes of flint, simply for their own sake, must be very curiously constituted, and to such an one the jests so commonly levelled

at antiquarian researches would apply in their fulness. In other branches of archaeology, those, for instance, which are concerned with really beautiful examples of the fine arts, there is a value in the objects themselves, irrespective of their proving anything. A statue or a picture, a castle or a cathedral, has a charm in itself, without at all bringing in its further undoubted value as throwing light upon the history and manners of the age which produced it. The principles of the arts themselves are a distinct branch of philosophy, as worthy of cultivation as any other. But the celt and the paalstab, even the gold armilla and the leaf-shaped bronze sword, have no such value as this; they are simply valuable as instrumental to a higher knowledge—as opening to us the wonderful stores of unrecorded history, and thereby contributing, in no small degree, to our general knowledge of man and his nature. Turn casually over an occasional paper on these subjects, and nothing seems more uninviting than the record of each particular discovery; even look at the objects themselves in an antiquarian collection, and the eye involuntarily turns away from the rough stone or the rusty iron, to the gorgeous works of a later period, to the brilliant enamel, the gold-tipped drinking-horn, or the jewelled chalice; but take the whole series of discoveries in their proper order and connexion, and they assume an interest absolutely fascinating. There is a peculiar charm, which the records of no historical period can supply, in thus groping through the darkness of the world's first ages, and exploring what was as mysterious to the earliest extant writers as it is in our own day. These relics, on which we hardly deign to cast a glance as we hurry on to more attractive objects, prove to be the most valuable of all lessons in the early history of mankind. They open to us the infancy of the world; we see the aboriginal settler, not only without the arts of civilized life, without letters and their results, but without metals, without agriculture, trusting himself to the waves in a fire-hollowed canoe, which he has wrought out of the primeval oaks of the forest, and waging war with no better weapons than bone and flint against denizens of the wilderness which have been removed from the register of existing beings. If these considerations raise some questions which it would be difficult to answer respecting the early condition of man,—whether, for instance, this rude mode of life was man's original state, or whether those who were condemned to it had lost the knowledge of arts with which their forefathers had been acquainted; still, when we consider in how many remote countries the

* Palgrave's History of England and Normandy, p. 469.

same phenomena are discovered, and how closely analogous is the course of improvement in nearly every case, they surely supply an additional argument in support of that revealed truth which every new scientific discovery seems the more strongly to confirm,—the essential unity of the human race.

The primeval period of Archaeology in any given country begins from an epoch of indefinite antiquity, and is terminated by whatever event brings it within the pale of written history;—events such as the Roman Conquest of Gaul or Britain, or the introduction of Christianity into countries beyond the limits of the empire. In England the heathen age of Anglo-Saxon occupation may perhaps be considered as a sort of return to the primeval period.* It may perhaps be most convenient not to draw the line very accurately at any particular date, but to use the word to designate, in the northern and western parts of Europe, all examples of native workmanship earlier than what would be recognised as mediæval.

This long range of time may in most countries be divided into the periods of *Stone*, *Bronze*, and *Iron*; so called from the material of which the most important weapons and utensils were made in each of them. They express three steps in a gradual march towards civilisation; the use of bronze being an advance over the entire ignorance of metals during the stone period, and that of iron, the most serviceable metal, being a further advance over that of bronze. Of the ornamental metals, gold seems to have been generally the first known, and accompanies the use of bronze articles; while silver, for the most part, does not appear till the age of iron.

Relics of the stone period are found over a very large portion of the earth. We find in the passage above referred to from Herodotus, that some of the “Æthiopians” had not got beyond it in the fifth century, B. C., and many barbarous and distant tribes remain in the same state till this day. “Implements of stone,” says Mr. Worsaae, (p. 128,) which are exactly similar, occur in Japan, in America, in the South Sea Islands, and elsewhere.” They belong to a particular stage of human development or retrogression, and not to any particular race.

“The substitution,” says Dr. Wilson, “of flint, stone, horn, and wood, in the absence of metal weapons and implements, must be abundantly familiar to all, in the customs of society when met with in a rude and primitive condition. The Fins and Esquimaux, the African Bushmen, and the natives of such of the Polynesian Islands as are rarely visited by Europeans, still construct knives and arrow-heads of flint or fish-bone, and supply themselves with wooden clubs and stone adzes and hammers, with little consciousness of imperfection or deficiency in such appliances. Examples of such a state of arts and human skill might be multiplied from the most dissimilar sources. It seems, as has been already remarked, to be a stage through which all nations have passed, not without each developing a sufficient individuality to render their arts well worthy of investigation by their descendants. To this primitive era of history we refer under the name of the Stone Period.”—P. 29.

It would seem to be a necessary consequence that the commencement of this state of things in any country coincides with the first appearance of human inhabitants in that country; that the stone period, wherever it occurs, must be the earliest of all; and the men of that period as strictly aborigines as any men are. Now, it is difficult to conceive how the knowledge of metals, which certainly existed in antediluvian times, could ever have been lost; but it is surely easier to imagine that it might be lost during long-continued wandering than that such an all-important knowledge should have slipped out of the hands of its possessors after they had made the remotest approach to settled habitations in any country. We may therefore conclude that the earliest men of the Stone Period were the earliest inhabitants of Britain or of any other country where their relics exist; for people in such a condition cannot be conceived to have entered it as conquerors of a people more advanced; the only conceivable case would be the exceptional one of their occupying a territory deserted by a more civilized race.

When these first inhabitants, then, reached Britain it is of course impossible to prove chronologically, but it could not have been at a very early stage of the great dispersion of the human race. An island at the extreme west of Europe might probably remain uninhabited long after countries nearer the general Asiatic centre had received a settled population and a social polity.

“Britain,” observes Dr. Latham,* “is an island. Everything relating to the natural history of the useful arts is so wholly uninvestigated, that no one has proposed even to approximate the date of the first launch of the first boat; in other words, of the first occupation of a piece of land surrounded by water. The

* The antiquities of this period bid fair to be well illustrated in Mr. Akerman's “Remains of Pagan Saxondom.”—we do not much admire the name—of which we have received the first part since this article was written.

“Britain,” observes Dr. Latham,* “is an island. Everything relating to the natural history of the useful arts is so wholly uninvestigated, that no one has proposed even to approximate the date of the first launch of the first boat; in other words, of the first occupation of a piece of land surrounded by water. The

* Man and his Migrations, p. 153. See also p. 95 of the same Work.

whole of that particular continent in which the first protoplasts saw light may have remained full to overflowing before a single frail raft had effected the first human migration. Britain may have remained a solitude for centuries and millenniums after Gaul had been full."

But, on the other hand, we have certain geological phenomena coming in to prove the immense positive antiquity of the date at which the first human occupation of Britain took place. The manner in which this subject is treated by Dr. Wilson forms, in our opinion, by far the most valuable and interesting portion of his work.

"We learn from an examination of the detritus and its included fossils, that at the period immediately preceding the occupation of the British Islands by their first colonists, the country must have been almost entirely covered with forests and overrun by numerous races of animals as long since extinct. . . . The most extensive discoveries of mammalian remains and recent skulls generally occur along the valleys by which the present drainage of the country takes place, and hence we infer that little change has taken place in its physical conformation since their deposition. . . . They belong to that period in which our planet was passing through its very latest stage of preparation prior to its occupation by man; a period on which the geologist, who deals with phenomena of the most gigantic character, and with epochs of vast duration, is apt to dwell with diminished interest, but which excites in the thoughtful mind a keener sympathy than all that preceded it. The general geographical disposition of the globe was then nearly as it still remains. Our own island was, during a great portion of it, insulated, as it is now. Yet it is of this familiar locality that the palæontologist remarks:—'In this island, anterior to the deposition of the drift, there was associated with the great extinct tiger, bear, and hyæna of the caves, in the destructive task of controlling the numbers of the richly developed order of the herbivorous mammalia, a feline animal, (the *Machairodus Latidens*), as large as the tiger, and to judge by its instruments of destruction, of greater ferocity.' It was within the epoch to which these strange mammals belong, and while some of them, and many other contemporaneous forms of being still animated the scene, that man was introduced upon this stage of existence, and received dominion over every living thing."—P. 22.

Dr. Wilson then quotes several instances in which the remains of extinct animals have been found with the marks of wounds evidently inflicted by human agency, and by the instrumentality of the rude weapons of the period we are now examining. He then proceeds with the following animated picture of primeval Britain and its inhabitants:—

"Thus much is apparent from the most superficial glance at the geological evidence of the primeval state of Britain within the historic era,

—that though corresponding in its great geographical outlines to its present condition, it differed, in nearly every other respect, as widely as it is possible for us to conceive of a country capable of human occupation. A continuous range of enormous forests covered nearly the whole face of the country. Vast herds of wild cattle, of gigantic proportions and fierce aspect, roamed through the chase, while its thickets and caves were occupied by carnivora, preying on the herbivorous animals, and little likely to hold in dread the armed savage who intruded on their lair. The whole of these have existed since the formation of the peat began, and therefore furnish some evidence of the very remote antiquity to which we must refer the origin of some of the wastes that supply, as will be seen in subsequent chapters, an important element in the elucidation of primitive chronology. Upon this singular arena Archæology informs us that the primeval Briton entered, unprovided with any of those appliances with which the arts of civilisation arm man against such obstacles. Intellectually, he appears to have been in nearly the lowest stage to which an intelligent being can sink; morally, he was the slave of a superstition, the grovelling character of which will be traced in reviewing his sepulchral rites; physically, he differed little in stature from the modern inheritors of the same soil, but his cerebral development was poor, his head small in proportion to his body, his hands, and probably his feet, also small; while the weapons with which he provided himself for the chase, and the few implements that ministered to his limited necessities, indicate only the crude development of that inventive ingenuity which first distinguishes the reason of man from the instincts of the brutes."—P. 27.

"The fossil cetacea especially," observes our author, "furnish most interesting and conclusive evidence of the very remote period at which the presence of a human population is discoverable in Scotland." He instances several cases in which fossil whales have been discovered in situations now considerably removed from the sea, and where the rude harpoon of deer's horn lay by the side of the animal. Boats of very primitive construction have also been dug up, imbedded deep in various positions now quite out of the reach of water.

"Some of these historic phenomena which are indicated above, required only time to produce them. The beds of sand and loam at Springfield, in which the ancient fleets of the Clyde have lain entombed for ages, are such as the slow depositions of winter floods will, for the most part, account for, if the chronologist can only spare for them the requisite centuries. Others seem to point to geological changes within the historic era of a more remarkable and extensive character. These it is not our province to explain. Whether the geologist find it most consistent with the established laws of his science to assume the standing of the whole ocean at higher levels within so recent a period,

or adopt the more probable theory of local upheaval and denudation, to account for these phenomena, this, at least, must be conceded, that the lapse of many ages is required for the changes which they indicate, and we can hardly err in inferring that civilisation had advanced but a little way on the plain of Nimroud, or the banks of the Nile, when the tiny fleets of the Clyde were navigating its estuary, and the hardy fishermen were following the whale in the winding creeks of the Forth."—P. 40.

Dr. Wilson has opened a curious field of inquiry in his chapter on "the Dwellings of the Stone period." The most interesting specimens of this primitive architecture are the subterranean vaults, locally known as weems;* some of which seem satisfactorily determined to be of this age, as stone celts and hammers have been found in them. But they must have been retained in use at a later period, as in one he mentions the discovery of a stone celt and a bronze sword.† This last circumstance throws some doubt upon an argument which might otherwise be brought to prove the practice of agriculture during the stone period, namely, the frequent occurrence in the weems of the quern or hand-mill. These structures are also extremely valuable to the architectural inquirer. "The walls are made to converge towards the top, and the whole is roofed in by means of the primitive substitute for the arch, which characterizes the Cyclopean structures of infant Greece, and the vast temples and palaces of Mexico and Yucatan. The huge stones overlap each other in succession, until the intervening space is sufficiently reduced to admit of the vault being completed by a single block extending from side to side."‡ In addition to the countries mentioned by Dr. Wilson, the same, or analogous, forms have been found in Italy and Egypt, where they have been developed into the real arch, as well as in Sardinia, India, and Peru, where, as in Greece and Yucatan, they appear to have got no further. "It is certainly most remarkable," says a recent writer, "to see exactly the same process, the same strivings after the advantages of an

arched construction, going on in such distant regions, where the idea of borrowing from one another is altogether out of the question. . . . These . . . instances . . . show that architecture is in most countries a plant of indigenous birth, and has everywhere passed through the same, or at least analogous stages. The want of the arch was almost universally felt, though it was not every nation that had the ability, or the good fortune to bring their strivings after it to a successful issue.*

The most important *tombs* of the Stone Period are the famous cromlechs, which, now that the common sense of Mr. Worsaae has once been applied to the subject, we trust no one will again speak of as Druidical altars. Both in Mr. Worsaae's and Dr. Wilson's works will be found numerous examples which must set the question at rest for ever. The general practice during this age was to bury the dead, but towards its close, according to Dr. Wilson,† the practice of cremation was introduced.

The *Bronze Period* is one of very much higher cultivation, as is at once shewn by the fact that it is the analogous stage to that of the heroes of Homer, among whom iron was not absolutely unknown, but bronze was the metal most frequently used. And the use of brazen arms certainly existed down to a much later period, as appears from the well known story of Psammetichus and the soldiers from Ionia and Caria.‡ But perhaps the people we are most familiar with at this stage are the ancient subjects of the Incas, who shew how high a degree of civilisation may be obtained without the use of what appears to us the absolute necessity of iron.§ The bronze stage, however is also found in nations very far behind the early Greeks or even the Peruvians. It was that of the barbarian Massagetæ in the time of Herodotus,|| and seems to have remained among the European Scythians, at least to the time of Philip.¶ Even now we are told that "the most usual weapon of the Hungarian peasant is a small brass axe, closely resembling that of (sic) the antique

* Under the same head, Dr. Wilson treats of those circular foundations of buildings, such as may be seen on St. David's Head, and on Worle Hill in Somersetshire, which surely belong to a later race. Dr. Wilson mentions that in Scotland they are called "Picts' Houses," so in Wales they are known as *Cyttiau y Gwyddelod*, *Cots of the Gael*; a coincidence which may possibly not be accidental.

† Dr. Wilson in the same chapter, (p. 77,) speaks of a dwelling of another kind in which iron was found, but he brings no evidence that it belonged to the stone period, and he suggests that "the torch of the Roman legionary applied the brand that reduced it to a blackened ruin."

‡ Wilson, p. 79.

* Freeman's *History of Architecture*, p. 47, et seq.

† P. 70, et seq.

‡ Herod. ii., 152.

§ Prescott's Peru, i. 139. "The natives were unacquainted with the use of iron, though the soil was largely impregnated with it. The tools used were of stone, or more frequently of copper. But the material on which they relied for the execution of their most difficult tasks was formed by combining a very small portion of tin with copper." That is bronze as distinguished from brass.

|| i. 215, οὐδὲν δὲ οὐδ' ἀργύρου χρῶνται οὐδὲν οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ σφί ἐστι ἐν τῇ χιῶνί, ὃ δὲ χρυσὸς καὶ ὁ χαλκὸς ἀπείρατος.

¶ Just. ix. 2.

'Celts.'** Both in Greece and Britain this stage is also marked by a great abundance of gold ornaments, silver being very much less in use. Cremation was now general, though not universal. The most remarkable relics of this date are the bronze swords and celts, of the latter of which Dr. Wilson has drawn up an elaborate classification.

Such is a brief view of the archæological facts connected with the two first periods, those of *Stone* and *Bronze*. We do not of course pretend to give here anything like a summary of the evidence on which these results depend, which we recommend our readers to study for themselves in the volumes of Mr. Worsaae and Dr. Wilson. We cannot understand how their general view of the three successive periods of Stone, Bronze, and Iron, can fail to approve itself almost to any mind even without evidence; it really carries its own intuitive conviction with it. And yet a certain class of antiquaries are content to jumble together everything anterior to the Roman invasion, under the meaningless name of Druidical. As Dr. Wilson observes (p. 104) with admirable truth and severity, "the convenient terms of Druid altars and temples have long supplied a ready resource for the absence of all knowledge of their origin and use. The cromlech has at length been restored to its true character as a sepulchral monument, by the very simple process of substituting investigation for theory." Mr. Worsaae has incontestably shewn (p. 85) that the cromlech *could* not have been an altar; the cromlech has been disinterred from beneath its covering of earth, and the barbarian himself has been disinterred from within his cromlech, and yet, with some persons, seeing is not believing. In the same spirit when a primitive boat was recently found, it was pronounced to be a "Druidical coffin;" and to crown all, the occupant of a tumulus in Carmarthenshire, whose skull we imagine would, in Dr. Wilson's hands, have at once proclaimed him an Allophylian, is personally identified with some imaginary British king!!! It is a pity that such inquirers have not the island of Crete for the scene of their investigations; they would surely before long, despite the warning of Callimachus, point out to us the true tokens of the tomb of Zeus.

But Druids and Druidism apart, we do not see how any one can fail to recognise at the first glance these three periods as following each other in the chronological sequence which we have assigned to each, though we

must of course be content with the sequences, without attempting to fix their respective duration. We cannot, however, forbear transcribing two unanswerable passages of Mr. Worsaae:—

"If, without any reference to history, we should seek to determine which of the two metals, copper or iron, was first discovered and used for weapons and tools, we should very readily come to a conclusion in favour of that which is most easily recognised as a metal when in the earth. Now, we know that copper is found in the mines in a state of such comparative purity as to require very little smelting for the purpose of being brought into a state fit for use, while, on the other hand, iron in its rough state looks more like a stone than a metal, and moreover, before it can be worked at all, must be subjected to a difficult process of smelting by means of a very powerful fire. If we look at the question only on this side, we are forced to conclude, that copper must have been found and employed before iron. And this is confirmed, not only by early historical notices, but also by recent investigations of ancient remains. In Asia, from whence the greater portion, probably all, the European races have migrated, numerous implements and weapons of copper have been discovered in a particular class of graves; nay, in some of the old and long abandoned mines in that country, workmen's tools have been discovered made of copper, and of a very remote antiquity. We see, moreover, how at a later period attempts were made to harden copper, and to make it better suited for cutting implements by a slight intermixture principally of tin. Hence arose that mixed metal to which the name of 'bronze' has been given, and which, according to the oldest writers of Greece and Rome, was generally used in the southern countries before iron.

"That that was the case farther north, and that in Denmark there was once a time—the so-called Bronze-period—in which weapons and cutting instruments were made of bronze, because the use of iron was either not known at all, or very imperfectly, we learn with certainty from our antiquities. We must not however by any means believe that the bronze period developed itself among the aborigines, gradually, or step by step, out of the stone period. On the contrary, instead of the simple and uniform implements and ornaments of stone, bone, and amber, we meet suddenly with a number and variety of splendid weapons, implements and jewels, of bronze, and sometimes indeed with jewels of gold. The transition is so abrupt, that from the antiquities we are enabled to conclude, what in the following pages will be further developed, that the bronze period must have commenced with the irruption of a new race of people possessing a higher degree of cultivation than the earlier inhabitants.

"As bronze tools and weapons spread over the land, the ancient and inferior implements of stone and bone were, as a natural consequence, superseded. This change however was by no means so rapid as to enable us to maintain with certainty, that from the beginning of the bronze period no stone implements were

* Pulszky's Traditions of Hungary, i. 314.

† See Archæologia Cambrensis, for April 1851 (p. 159); a publication which usually steers clear of such folly.

used in Denmark. The universal diffusion of metals could only take place by degrees. Since in Denmark itself, neither copper nor tin occurs, so that these metals, being introduced from other countries, were of necessity expensive, the poorer classes continued for a long series of years to make use of stone as their material; but it also appears that the richer, at all events in the earlier periods, in addition to their bronze implements, still used others of stone, particularly such as would have required a large quantity of metal for their formation. In tombs, therefore, which decidedly belong to the bronze period, we occasionally meet with wedges and axes, knives and axes, but most frequently hammers, all of stone, which must have been used at a much later period. A great number of them very carefully wrought, and also bear evident marks of having been bored through with round metal cylinders. But although implements of stone and bronze were at a certain period used together, yet it is an established fact that a period first prevailed during which stone alone was used for implements and weapons; and that subsequently a time arrived when the use of bronze appears to have been the all-prevailing custom."—Pp. 23-25.

In the other he argues with equal cogency from the sepulchral rites of the successive periods:—

"From the fact that bodies during the bronze period were burned, it may be conceived that the bronze period is later than the stone period, in which it was the general custom to bury the dead without burning. This latter method of interment is peculiar to uncultivated nations, and is unquestionably the most simple and the most natural; the custom of burning the dead supposes a certain development of religious feeling which is only to be found among such nations as have acquired some degree of civilisation. It was a totally different matter, however, when, towards the close of Paganism in the north, cultivation having obtained a higher grade, men once more adopted the custom of interring their dead without first burning them. This fact by no means invalidates the assertion, that the mode of interment of the stone period is the most ancient. That the stone period extends farthest into antiquity, the tombs which belong to it afford the most unquestionable proofs. At the summit and on the sides of a barrow are often found vessels of clay, with burnt bones and articles of bronze, while at the base of the hill we meet with the ancient cromlechs, or giant's chambers, with unburnt bodies and objects of stone. From this it is obvious that at a later time, possibly centuries after, poorer persons, who had not the means to construct barrows, used the ancient tombs of the stone period, which they could do with the more security, since a barrow which is piled above a giant's chamber had exactly the same appearance as a barrow of the bronze period. To prevent misunderstanding it must here be observed, that many persons are of opinion, from the appearance of the barrows when

opened, that the different modes of interment of the periods of stone and bronze, the placing bodies in cromlechs and the burning them, prevailed universally at one and the same time. This opinion has, however, been founded in most cases on very loose grounds, since sufficient attention has not been paid to distinguishing the different modes of interment at the base and the summit of the barrows; for the fact that two kinds of interment occur in the same barrow, by no means proves that such interments belong to the same era. The circumstance, moreover, that together with unburnt bodies vessels of clay have also been found, in the cromlechs and giants' chambers, has given rise to error. These vessels contain, as we have seen, merely loose earth; but formerly it was constantly and erroneously conceived, that all vessels of clay found in barrows were urns for ashes, and had been filled with burnt human bones. We are certainly not justified in positively denying, that burnt human bones have ever been found in a legitimate grave of the stone period, but experience has hitherto shewn us, that between the tombs of the stone period and those of the bronze period, there exists a difference as great, and in fact greater, than that which prevails between the antiquities of the two periods."—Pp. 94, 95.

Our present subject is not ethnology but "Primeval Archaeology;" so we shall not enter into any questions connected with the former, which can be considered as at all directly historical, but shall confine ourselves solely to that obscure branch, which is, in truth, a part of Primeval Archaeology, or, more accurately speaking, constitutes the end of that study. Any questions touching the historic inhabitants of this island, the Celtic and Teutonic tribes, we shall, for the present, postpone. We only wish to call attention to the view, which, greatly in consequence of the labours of Mr. Worsaae and Dr. Wilson, is beginning to be generally received, namely, that the remains of the stone period belong to an entirely extinct race. We have only, previous to this question, to take a very cursory view of the existing population of the British isles, so as to see how its analogies bear on the pre-historic period.

Contemplating the population of Britain as we see it at present, and taking in as part of the picture all that we can learn from recorded history, we get something like the following. Two main races occupy these islands, the *Celtic* and the *Teutonic*, and the earlier possession of the former we may safely set down as a historical fact. Again, we find in the Celtic race two marked branches, the Gael of the Scotch Highlands, Ireland, and the Isle of Man, the Cymry who still remain in Wales and Cornwall, and who existed in historical times through most parts of England, and in compara-

tively recent ages retained a large district on the western portion of the Scottish border, where they left their name to an English county. The Teutonic population occupies England and the Scottish Lowlands, and though formed out of a junction of numerous Germanic tribes, and with a strong Scandinavian element in its northern and eastern portions, is a much nearer approach to an ethnological unity than the Celtic. Neither now nor a thousand years back can as much difference be found between Angle and Saxon, or even between Saxon and Northman, as still exists between Gael and Cymry. Taking a glance at the map we see that the great mass of the island is Teutonic, the Celt being driven into the northern and western parts* of Great Britain, and into the island still farther removed from the rest of the world. History tells us, what the state of the case might have told for itself, that the Celt once occupied a much larger portion of the island than at present, and that the invading Teuton has dispossessed him of the fairest portion of his patrimony, and driven him into remote corners of the land.

Thus far we cannot well go wrong; but when we see the gradual advance of population from "the eastern cradle-land of man," sweeping, wave upon wave, Celtic, Teutonic, Slavic, with, on the whole, a wonderful regularity, we are tempted to ask two questions: *first*, is it not possible that the Celts themselves were not the first wave, but dispossessed some earlier inhabitants? *secondly*, when we see the wide diversity between the two Celtic branches, may not one of these have stood in the same relation to the other as they both did to the Teuton?

On this last question we cannot now enter. We only allude to it as the subject of the third work on our list, the learned and acute treatise of the able Secretary of the Cambrian Antiquaries being specially devoted to this purpose. We trust, on some other occasion, to point out the happy union of local experience and historical acumen which he has brought to bear on this important question. At present we can only mention, what is of some consequence to our present subject in the way of analogy, that his researches tend strongly to confirm the view entertained by Lhuyd and others, that, of the two Celtic branches, the Gael preceded the Cymry in the possession of

the whole of the islands, and have been since driven into the remote portions in which alone we find their historic homes. Gael, Cymry, and Teuton would thus be three successive waves of population, following each upon the one immediately before it in a north-westerly direction.

We have now gone back as far as history and tradition can carry us, and have found the Gael the earliest historical occupants of Britain, the advanced guard of the great Arian migration. They are certainly the oldest race now existing in Britain, probably the oldest that have left any trace even in local nomenclature. But were they the first inhabitants of all? Was the barbarian who harpooned the whale in the Clyde at all the ancestor of the Gael who made the last stand for his nationality at Culloiden? As far as history and tradition* goes, he might be; but archæological evidence tells us another story.

There are no ante-Arian races or other than archæological vestiges now existing in Britain; but such is far from being the case on the Continent. On the confines of France and Spain still exist the remnants of the Basque or Euskarian race, which is now recognised as of Allophylian† origin; and there is every reason to believe that they represent the old Iberians,‡ and consequently that there is a great non-Arian element in the existing population of Spain. Besides this, traces of their presence are left in the local nomenclature of many other parts of the south of Europe. Moreover, at the opposite end of that continent we find the various branches of the Finnish race, many of which still remain in a state of barbarism, and who appear, in comparatively recent times, to have occupied a much larger portion of the Scandinavian peninsula. We find, then, that in other countries which exhibit the same archæological phenomena as Britain, and where the Celtic race still exists, as very conspicuously in France, that race was not the first which occupied the country, but had a precursor in a people which is still numbered among existing nations. Again, driven up into a still more remote corner, we find another people,

* We cannot build much on the obscure tradition mentioned by Thierry, about an extinct race of hunters, who, "instead of dogs, trained foxes and wild cats for the chase." This sounds like a lower race than the Gael, yet the Welsh tradition would appear to apply to them.

† For this convenient name for undefined non-Arian peoples we need not say we are indebted to Dr. Prichard.

‡ This, we need not say, is convincingly shown by Dr. Prichard in the third volume of his *Physical History*. See also Arnold's *Rome*, i. 488.

* That the extreme north of Scotland and the extreme west of Wales are both Teutonic is a singular fact, but, as it arises from comparatively recent settlements, does not affect the general law of their occupation.

equally or more unconnected with the general population of Europe, and undoubtedly a mere vestige of a once more widely extended race. Hence alone we might be tempted to put together the Finnish hypothesis of Rask,* which represents these detached fragments as vestiges of a great race which once possessed the whole intervening region, but which have been separated from one another by the successive inroads of the various Arian tribes. This alone would make us look for ante-Celtic authors of the earliest antiquities through all the region. But, besides this, we have the anatomical fact that the crania in the tombs of the stone period are not Celtic, but of another character. Again, the use of the cromlech, the tomb of the stone period, is remarkably confined to a well-ascertained region; if that species of tomb were of Celtic origin, we should have expected the limits of that region to have coincided with the territory known to have been possessed by Celtic inhabitants. But this is far from the case. Cromlechs occur throughout a long tract in the west of Europe, chiefly along the coast, in south-western Sweden, Denmark, the British isles, northern Germany, France, and the Spanish peninsula.† Of these, Britain, Gaul, and Spain have had Celtic inhabitants, but there is no evidence that the Celts ever settled in any part of Scandinavia; whereas, as Mr. Worsaae says—

“In previous times they had undoubtedly occupied a much greater extent of the present country of Germany, particularly its middle and southern parts, where the names of localities, mountains, and rivers, are very frequently of Celtic origin; in which regions, however, the characteristic cromlechs, with unburnt bodies, instruments of flint, and ornaments of amber, have not as yet been found. Had cromlechs of this nature been the most ancient Celtic graves, we should certainly have expected to have found them in the countries first inhabited by the Celts. But what is more, in the west of Europe there appears not to have been any transition from the cromlech to the barrow: they are totally different.”—P. 132.

An ingenious philological argument has also been brought by Dr. Wilson. He derives the Celtic word cromlech‡ from *crommach*, (Gaelic,) or *cromen*, (Welsh,) signifying a *roof* or *vault*, and *clach* or *lech*, a stone.” He adds that, as the name is Celtic, if the thing be Allophylian, “the old name of cromlech is of recent origin compared with the

structures to which it is applied; and of this its derivation affords the strongest confirmation. It is just such a term as strangers would adopt, being simply descriptive of the actual appearance of the monument, but conveying no idea of its true character as a sepulchral memorial.”*

We may, therefore, safely conclude, that the monuments of the stone period belong to an ante-Celtic race, and we shall probably not be far wrong in supposing, that the whole cromlech country from Denmark to Portugal was once occupied by an Allophylian race, of whom the Basques are the existing remnant. From Britain and Northern Gaul they were dispossessed by the Celts; from their Scandinavian settlements, apparently by the existing Danes.†

But a farther question now arises, Were the Basques the earliest inhabitants of these countries, or did they in their turn dispossess some still more remote occupants? This partly turns on the degrees of affinity supposed to exist between the Basque and the Finnish nations. Dr. Prichard‡ seems to admit an analogy, though a remote one, between their respective languages, and such an one is also said to exist between their skulls; but certainly in other respects it would be an insult to compare the two. The Fins were in the lowest state of barbarism in the time of Tacitus, and have certainly, to say the least, not developed since in the same proportion as the Teutonic and Celtic races. But the Iberians, unlike the Fins, have always had a certain civilisation. And still more, as Mr. Worsaae shows, where the Fins exist, or can be shown to have existed, as in Norway and the greater part of Sweden, the cromlech does not occur. We may therefore follow Mr. Worsaae in saying,—

“The first people who inhabited the north of Europe were without doubt Nomadic races, of whom the Laplanders, or, as they were formerly called, the Fins, are the remains. They had no settled habitations, but wandered from place to place, and lived on vegetables, roots, hunting, and fishing. After them came another race, who evidently advanced a step farther, since they did not follow this unsettled wandering life, but possessed regular and fixed habitations. This people diffused themselves along those coasts which afforded them fitting opportunities for hunting and fishing; while voyages by sea and agriculture also appear to have commenced among them. This race, however, seems not to have penetrated the interior parts of Europe, which were at that time full of immense bogs and woods: they wanted metal for felling trees, and so opening the interior of the country, for which purpose their simple implements of stone were insufficient. They followed only the open

* See Man and his Migrations, 181.

† Worsaae, 105.

‡ Not from the imaginary Irish Jupiter Tonans, “*Crom*.” See Archæologia Cambrensis, 1849, p. 311; 1850, pp. 14, 158.

* P. 69.

† Worsaae, p. 144.

‡ iii. 22.

coasts, and the shores of the rivers or large lakes. To this period belong the cromlechs, or giants' chambers, and the antiquities of stone and bone exhumed from them."—P. 134.

Dr. Wilson, in like manner, considers that he has established *two* Allophylian or ante-Celtic races in Britain, with different skulls and different sepulchral rites, and that the latter were a great advance on the former, and probably entered Britain as conquerors. It is a great temptation to look on them as Fins and Basques respectively; but neither does he himself attempt to make out such a case, nor does he supply sufficient data for the purpose; especially since, if we rightly understand him, cremation was introduced by his second Allophylian race. (P. 72.)

Now, who were the men of the bronze and iron periods? At this stage of our argument we are strongly tempted to wish, either that we were writing on Scandinavian instead of British antiquities, or that we had Mr. Worsaae as a direct guide to the latter. It is with the greatest reluctance that we refrain from transcribing his account of these two periods in the north, so irresistibly clear and cogent is every word of his argument. But, unfortunately, from this point his investigations are of comparatively little service to British antiquaries, as from hence the course of immigration in Britain and in Denmark is, as we have seen, completely different. And we have now passed the most valuable portion of Dr. Wilson's book. His great point is, as we have said, in connecting archaeology with geology and anatomy; in the latter stages, which we have now reached, his habit of scattering his conclusions up and down among his data renders it difficult to make out what his conclusions are.

The passage which approaches most nearly to a definite statement is the following:—

"We have seen, in so far as the imperfect data already referred to afford trustworthy indications of the physical characteristics of the primitive colonists of Britain, that the race of the later era differed greatly from their elder, and probably aboriginal precursors of the primeval period. We must depend not only on the united observations of British archaeologists for adding to these ethnological data, but also on continental research for supplying the necessary elements of comparison by which we may hope to trace out the origin of the Brachy-kephalic race of Scotland, to whom it seems probable that the introduction of the primitive metallurgic arts must be ascribed; while it may be that we shall yet be able clearly to associate the full development of these prior to the working of iron, with the intrusion of the Celtic upon the elder Allophylian British races."—P. 205.

From this we should have inferred that

the Celts (Gauls) first introduced the use of bronze,* and that the Brachycephali (the second or better Allophylian race) learned of them the use, though probably not the manufacture, (Wilson, pp. 205,† 233,) just as in the course of extermination of aborigines which has been carried on by Europeans in so many lands, some portion of the conquerors' civilisation is extended to the vanquished before he disappears from the earth. Yet some way after he tells us,—

"In the present state of archaeological inquiry, it would be presumptuous to assign dogmatically the precise races to which the arts of each period pertain. Still, the indications both of archaeological and direct historical evidence manifestly point to the Celtæ as comparatively late intruders, and leave us to seek, with little hesitation, in their Allophylian precursors for the metallurgists of the Archaic period. In the Kumbe-kephalic *Allophyliæ*, we may expect to trace the rude primeval workers in stone with undefined sepulchral rites, and no distinct evidences of a faith or hope beyond the grave. Upon this meanly gifted race, the Brachy-kephalic *Allophyliæ* intruded, bringing with them, in all probability, the knowledge of metallurgic arts, yet effecting their aggressions by such slow degrees that, as we have seen, these arts appear to have reached our northern regions long before the rude aborigines were called upon to employ them in repelling their originators. From these as well as other arguments we infer, that when the earliest Celtic nomades first reached our coasts, they found the older natives already in possession of weapons of bronze, and familiar with the most essential processes of the metallurgist."—P. 343.

Now we really cannot quite reconcile these passages. Our own *guess*—it is not much more—would be that the Gael or Gwyddyl introduced bronze into Britain—where they discovered its use is another matter—and that whatever knowledge the second Allophylians had of it, was derived from them. The bronze celt and even the leaf-shaped sword, may have been used against the invading Gael, just as the musket of European

* Dr. Wilson has, in our eyes, wasted many words in disputing against a proposition in a passage of Mr. Worsaae's quoted above, implying that the bronze period marked the intrusion of a conquering race, whereas he supposes what he calls a "metallurgic transition," when bronze and stone were used simultaneously. Now Mr. Worsaae (pp. 24, 25) most clearly admits a "metallurgic transition;" and as far as we can discover Dr. Wilson's meaning, he admits the intrusion of the *ἀνδρες χάλκεοι*, (Brachycephali), as conquerors. Both seem to us to mean precisely the same thing,—that bronze was introduced by a conquering race, but that the conquered learned to use, if not to work it, before their final extirpation.

† "The weapons and implements," he acutely observes, "would in many localities long precede the knowledge of the art by which they were formed."—P. 205.

civilisation may in our own times be seen in the hands of the native barbarians engaged in repelling that very civilisation in its further advances. In Scotland, especially, one can hardly conceive the Gael as greatly circumscribing the territory of the Allophylians till they were themselves sore pressed by the Cymry ; so that there may even have been an interval of peace—such peace as we may imagine in such a state of society—during which the *savage* Allophylian may have freely profited by the arts of the *barbarian* Gael.

We are led to this view, that the first Celtic invaders, that is the Gael, must have first introduced bronze implements, by the consideration that the cromlechs belong to the latest and most advanced portion of the stone period. We have seen that they are the work of that second Allophylian people which we have endeavoured to identify with the Basque or Iberian race. But the cromlechs belong wholly to the stone period, though to its latest stage ; no metallic articles being, to the best of our knowledge, ever found in them. It seems to follow, then, that the Basque population in Britain had no original knowledge of metals, but that they were introduced by the next race that entered the island, that is, by the Gael or earliest Celts.

If we are right in thus supposing the first Celtic invaders to have introduced the use of bronze, we have now landed on something like historic ground, and the further consideration of the use of iron, whether due to another Celtic race or to a Teutonic immigration, belongs to a subject which we have for the present postponed. The strictly primeval or pre-historic period is now over. Gael and Cymry are existing races, each possessing an existing language and literature, and we are now professing only to deal with those races of men to whose existence no other clue is provided beside the labours of the antiquary. But even with regard to these remoter and darker ages, we would fain have them believe that "lost," is not, as Sir F. Palgrave would teach us "lost," nor "gone, gone, for ever." We endeavour to deduce a theory from facts—facts that cannot lie, and which speak to us more clearly than all the triads and traditions of all the Druids, Bards, and Ovates, that may have been created from Brute to the last Eisteddfod ; we seek not for detailed history, but for truth of another kind, yet no less real than the facts that shine forth most clearly in the noblest contemporary narrative. A truer and deeper philosophy breathes in the following extract.

"How undeniable soever the proposition that the history of a country, that is, a narrative of events and actions connected and chronologically arranged, can be conceived which shall be independent of written materials, or, as they are called, immediate sources, it is not less certain that monuments and remains of antiquity, other than literary, have a just claim to be considered as indirect sources for the same historical result. Even if such may not avail to make us acquainted with new positive facts, if they fail to certify a list of sovereigns, or to fix a series of dates, they may yet serve, collectively considered, to give us a clearer perception of the religion, the culture, the external life, and other particulars of our forefathers, than can be supplied even by the written sources, to which latter no such high antiquity can be ascribed, in which old traditions are mixed up with newer, and which, as they have been committed to writing in later times, must have been liable to many corruptions of the text. The other remains of which we speak, form, some of them, a complement to the literary, extending our knowledge beyond the periods when the latter begin to deserve belief, and sometimes awakening and fortifying conjectures as to emigrations and connexions of nations, respecting which history is silent. But even the mute memorials have a still higher significance for us. They lead us back to the original population of our northern country ; they make us live again our fathers' life. A grave mound, a lonely circle of stones, a stone implement, a metal ornament excavated from the covered chamber of death, afford a livelier image of antiquity than Saxo, or Snorre, the Eddas, or the Germany of Tacitus. And will not the explorer of the past contemplate a work of the art of the middle ages with an interest which no record can excite ?

"Accordingly, there never has been a period since our history began to be cultivated and studied but these monuments have formed an object of attention and investigation, although often viewed in a false light, and though the subject has been treated in a tasteless and unscientific manner. . . . But, again, the remains of the past require the attention bestowed on them, by assisting other scientific purposes than the strictly historical. They assist to answer questions as to the natural history of our northern countries, their people, changes of climate, and the like."—*Guide to Northern Archaeology*, pp. 25, 26.

The last clause brings us back to the most valuable portions of Dr. Wilson's book, on which we cannot help once more pronouncing our hearty commendation.

ART. VII.—1. *Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature*. By RICHARD WHATELY, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. 2d edit. London, 1837.

2. *Cautions for the Times: Addressed to the Parishioners of a Parish in England by their former Rector.* Published occasionally: Seventeen Nos. 1851-52.

WE have always had a great admiration of the talents of Archbishop Whately, and a very high appreciation of the services which he has rendered to the world by his valuable and voluminous writings. He has written upon a great variety of most important subjects—theological and ecclesiastical, philosophical and political; and upon the discussion of all of them he has brought to bear a very high measure of excellencies, both intellectual and moral. He is possessed of a very rare combination of ingenuity and sagacity, of penetration and soundness of judgment. He has always advocated and practised the fullest and freest investigation of every subject of interest and importance, and has conducted his own inquiries upon most topics with an amount of real fairness and candour which are by no means common in controversial discussions, even among men of integrity and honour. We regard Dr. Whately as occupying a very high place among the educators of the cultivated intellect of the age. We assign to him this most honourable position, not so much because of the amount of important truth which he has taught and commended to men's acceptance—though his services in this respect have been great—but rather because of what he has done, directly and indirectly, by precept and example, in shewing men, how their faculties may be most fully cultivated and most successfully employed in the investigation of truth; in what way the dangers arising from the obscurities and ambiguities of language ought to be guarded against; and what are the spirit and temper in which truth ought to be sought and investigation ought to be conducted. In these respects Dr. Whately has rendered most important permanent services to the community, which entitle him to the admiration, the respect, and the gratitude of all who are interested in the intellectual and moral advancement of society.

We differ, materially and decidedly, from some of Dr. Whately's views upon theological subjects, but we have no sympathy with the persevering attempts which have been made, not only by the Tractarians or Puseyites, but also by the old orthodox party in the Church of England, as they call themselves, to run him down as a heretic. We believe that, whether tried by the standard of the Sacred Scriptures, or of the symbolical books of the Church of England, Dr. Whately is much more orthodox in his

theological sentiments, than *these* classes of his accusers, that their charges against him upon this subject are in a great measure hypocritical, and are to be traced, to a large extent, to the unfriendly, and even malignant feeling awakened in their minds by his able and consistent advocacy of liberal principles on ecclesiastical and political matters.

There are some subjects on which we think Dr. Whately has displayed great ability and candour, even when he has not, in our judgment, arrived at sound conclusions regarding them. One of the most striking and important instances of this, is to be found in his giving up the argument commonly adduced by Arminians against Calvinism from the moral character and government of God. Dr. Whately, himself an Arminian, virtually admits that the argument derived from this source, which has hitherto formed almost the whole stock-in-trade of the opponents of the Calvinistic system, is irrelevant and unsatisfactory, inasmuch as it does not really bear upon the peculiar doctrines of Calvinism, but upon great facts or results actually occurring under God's moral government. The reality of these facts or results is not disputed; and Dr. Whately, in substance, admits, that Arminians are just as much bound to explain them, and as incapable of explaining them fully, as Calvinists are. In short, he admits that the fundamental question between Calvinists and Arminians, so far as concerns its relation to the Divine moral character and government, virtually resolves into that of the existence and permanence of moral evil in the world—a question of which both parties are equally called upon, and equally incompetent, to give a satisfactory solution. It is quite true that Calvinists have often proved all this by arguments which are unanswered and unanswerable. But as we do not remember that the admission was ever before so fully and frankly made by an Arminian, we regard it as most creditable to Dr. Whately's ability and candour, and value it as a most important concession to the cause of truth.

It is honourable to Dr. Whately, that, after reaching the highest rank in his profession, he should continue, while diligently discharging the appropriate duties of his office, to labour for the public good through the press. He has written and published a great deal since he became Archbishop of Dublin, and he could scarcely have given a more satisfactory evidence of his ability and willingness to be still labouring for the welfare of the community, than by preparing and publishing the "*Cautions for the Times*," mentioned at the head of this Article.

These Cautions have been published occasionally for about a year and a half past, and now amount to seventeen. They profess to be the productions of several persons; but it is understood that they are composed principally by Dr. Whately, and that they have been all published under his superintendence. As a whole they are quite worthy of his high standing and his distinguished reputation. They contain much important matter, deserving of a wide circulation, because fitted to be eminently useful. The first eight Cautions treat of topics connected with the Romish controversy, and the remainder present a very valuable exposure of the tendencies of Tractarianism and of the conduct of its advocates. It is to the first of these topics only that we mean at present to advert, and in doing so we shall consider the Cautions in connexion with Dr. Whately's work, entitled "Essays on the Errors of Romanism having their Origin in Human Nature." This work is one of the ablest and most valuable of all those which bear Dr. Whately's name; and he has devoted two of the Cautions, the fifth, in two parts, and the sixth, to what is in substance, though it does not profess to be so, a summary or abridgment of the Essays.

The first of the Cautions is on the subject of the late Papal Aggression. We do not quite concur in some of the views it advocates. Its general tone is adverse to the propriety and expediency of the "Ecclesiastical Titles Bill," and we have already had an opportunity of explaining the grounds on which we regard that measure as thoroughly justifiable in itself, and imperatively called for by the whole circumstances of the case.* It is undoubtedly true, as Dr. Whately argues, that Romanism can be effectually and permanently guarded against, not by civil enactments, but only by considerations addressed to the understandings and consciences of men, and that every real infringement upon the principles of toleration is fitted to injure the good cause which it may have been intended to benefit. But even amid the first excitement produced by the Papal aggression, there was no real danger of these truths being overlooked. Dr. Whately's sensitiveness upon this point we regard as unreasonable and exaggerated, and as fitted to produce the injurious effect, of giving an appearance of countenance to the shameless attempt of Cardinal Wiseman and his friends to represent themselves as martyrs in the cause of religious liberty.

In the beginning of the ninth Caution, before proceeding to consider the principles of

the Tractarian, or, as he calls it, the "Tractite," party, the author gives the following statement of the objects of the seven preceding numbers.

"We considered (in Nos. II., III., and VIII.) some of the most plausible popular topics advanced by Romish controversialists; and lest it should be thought that we had misrepresented the force of their reasonings, we examined (in Nos. IV. and VII.) a great number of the Tracts which some of the ablest and most dexterous managers of their cause are now busy circulating through England; and we made it (as we trust) pretty plain that, wherever the secret of their success *does* lie, it does *not* lie in the strength of their arguments.

"But the secret of their success is to be found (as we pointed out in Nos. V. and VI.) in the tendency of corrupt human nature towards such a system as the Romish. Each of us has a traitor in his own breast, always ready and willing to open the gate to the enemy. We are all naturally *prone* to those errors upon which Romanism is built; and, in consequence of that natural proneness, too many Protestants have already admitted principles which, if fairly carried out, must inevitably lead to the reception of the whole body of Romish tenets. The seed has been, as it were, already deposited in their minds. It *may* lie long dormant. But as soon as circumstances favour its growth, it will spring up after its kind, and bear the proper fruits of its species.

"You may see a clear proof of this in the progress of what is called the 'Tractite' party towards Romanism."

In the five numbers which discuss "some of the most plausible popular topics advanced by Romish controversialists," and expose the sophistries and misrepresentations of a recent series of Popish tracts, there are some very successful specimens of argumentation, instances in which we think the common reasonings of Romanists are admirably well refuted, at once by clear and sagacious exposition and by felicitous illustration. We select some passages in confirmation of this opinion.

"The truth is, that *our* religion is the *old* one, and theirs the *new*; only *their* corruptions do not wear the garb of novelty, because they came in without being perceived; silently and gently, through a long lapse of time; whereas our *reformation* of them, and restoration of the primitive faith, was made suddenly and all at once. When you scour a room, you remove, in an hour or two, dirt which had been gathering for several days: yet that is only called *keeping it clean*, not changing it; and so, when you wash your face, or brush your clothes. If the corruptions of the Church of Rome had been thrown off one by one, each soon after it came in, no one would have thought such a continual *keeping the Church clean* to be innovation. But, because they were left to accumulate too long, and a great general

* *North British Review*, No. xxix. pp. 281-289.

correction had to be made suddenly and at once, therefore the restoration of the old state of things seems, to ignorant people, the bringing in of a new one.

"What is called 'the change of the style' is a striking instance of a seeming *innovation*, which was really a *restoration*, being a return to the right course, by a sudden correction of a great error that had resulted from the accumulation of imperceptibly small ones. The year contains 365 days and (*almost*) a quarter. To keep the reckoning right an additional day is inserted in February, every fourth (leap) year, to make up the four quarters of a day. But this addition is a *very little too much*; the excess amounting to three days in every 400 years. And this continually increasing error went on uncorrected (in this country) till it amounted to eleven days. In the middle of the last century we corrected it by adopting what is called 'the new style,' and at once cutting off those days; just as one puts forward the hands of a clock which has lost. But this, though it was, in truth, only a *restoration* of the true time, appeared to ignorant people a great and offensive *innovation*, because it was a correction made all at once, of an error which had crept in by little."—Pp. 17, 18.

"But the point which Roman Catholics love most to dwell on is the *weakness of private judgment*, which they represent as a prevailing reason why we should rather give ourselves up to the direction of an infallible guide. In answer to this, several Protestant writers have very well defended the *right* of private judgment; others have preferred to regard it as a *duty*, and in truth the exercise of it is both a *right* and a *duty*; or rather, a *right because* it is a duty. But the most important consideration of all is the *necessity* of private judgment. A man who resolves to place himself under a certain guide to be implicitly followed, and decides that such and such a Church is the appointed infallible guide, does decide on his own private judgment, *that one* most important point, which includes in it all other decisions relative to religion. And if, by his own shewing, he is *unfit to judge* at all, he can have no ground for confidence that he has decided rightly in that. And if, accordingly, he will not trust himself to judge even on this point, but resolves to consult his priest, or some other friends, and be led entirely by *their* judgment thereupon, still he does, in thus resolving, exercise his own judgment as to the counsellors he so relies on. The responsibility of forming some judgment is one which, however unfit we may deem ourselves to bear it, we cannot possibly get rid of, in any matter about which we really feel an anxious care. It is laid upon us by God, and we cannot shake it off. Before a man can rationally *judge* that he should *submit his judgment* in other things to the Church of Rome, he must first have judged. 1. That there is a God; 2. That Christianity comes from God; 3. That Christ has promised to give an infallible authority in the Church; 4. That such authority resides in the Church of Rome. Now, to say that men who are competent to form sound judgments upon these points are quite incompetent to form sound judgments about any other matters in religion, is very like saying, that men may have sound judgments of their own *before*

they enter the Church of Rome, but that they *lose* all sound judgment entirely from the moment they enter it."—Pp. 21, 22.

"Again, when Roman Catholics would persuade us to receive their *traditions* of doctrine as certain truths, without examining them by the test of Scripture, they are fond of reminding us that it is by *tradition* only that we have the Scriptures themselves. But when you meet such persons, you may ask them, whether they would as readily believe the correctness of a report transmitted by *word of mouth* in popular rumours, from one end of the kingdom to another, as if it came in a *letter*, passed from one person to another over the same space? Would they think, that because they could trust most servants to deliver a letter, however long or important, *therefore* they could trust the same men to deliver the contents of a long and important letter in a message by word of mouth? Let me put a familiar case. A footman brings you a letter from a friend, upon whose word you can perfectly rely, giving an account of something that has happened to himself, and the exact account of which you are greatly concerned to know. While you are reading and answering the letter, the footman goes into the kitchen, and there gives your cook an account of the same thing; which, he says, he overheard the upper-servants at home talking over, as related to them by the valet, who said he had it from your friend's son's own lips. The cook retails the story to your groom, and he, in turn, tells you. Would you judge of that *story* by the letter, or the *letter* by the story?

"The case of the Jewish Church is an apt illustration of the difference of security in the tradition of Scripture and the tradition of doctrine. The Jews, we know, faithfully preserved the writings of the Old Testament, which were entrusted to them. Nor do Christ and His Apostles ever charge them with corrupting or destroying their sacred books, as no doubt they would have done, if the Jews had been guilty of any such crime. But our Saviour *does* blame them for 'making the Word of God of none effect by their traditions,' and 'teaching for doctrines the commandments of men.' Might not the Jews argue, in their turn, that if we receive the Old Testament from them, we should also receive, their traditions? the *oral* law (as they call it), no less than the *written* law? But our Saviour always teaches the people to bring the traditions of the elders to the test of the written word."—Pp. 23, 24.

"Again, the invocation of *departed* saints, and especially of the blessed Virgin Mary, as practised in the Church of Rome, is a thing plainly contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. For—not to mention that it is at least very doubtful as to some of their so-called saints, whether they ever existed at all—and as to others, whether they were not mere crazy fanatics—and as to others, whether they were not very wicked men—not to mention this, and supposing these 'saints' to have been all really good Christians, you will readily see that asking a *dead* person to pray for you, when you do not know him to be present, is quite a different thing from asking a *living* person to pray for you. The Scriptures never tell us that the dead can hear or know the

requests which men make to them; so that asking their prayers *at all* is a piece of 'will-worship' that cannot be justified. We might, for all that appears, just as reasonably go down on our knees and ask a good man in America to pray for us. But when it came to be believed that a holy person, when *removed from earth*, can hear the addresses of thousands and millions calling on him in all parts of the world, and can know the secret dispositions of mind in each several person that invokes him, this belief did, in fact, *deify* him. Whatever subtle explanations may be attempted of the way in which 'glorified saints' are able to hear, from various regions, and repeat more prayers in the day than there are minutes in the twenty-four hours, it is plain that at least the great mass of their worshippers must regard them no less as *gods* than the ancient pagans did the beings they worshipped. For the pagans acknowledged that many of the gods whom they worshipped had been MEN; only they fancied that, after death, their souls had obtained great power and influence over the management of things in the world; which is what was meant by calling them *gods*.

"Now, as the Almighty has declared Himself to be 'A JEALOUS GOD'—just as unwilling to have His honour impaired as if He were jealous of it—and as he always treated the conduct of the pagans in thus praying to dead men as idolatry, it cannot be safe in us to encourage anything like a practice which He abhors; particularly as, even if the saints *can* hear our prayers, there is plainly no *necessity* for praying to them, since God invites us at all times to 'come boldly' to himself, through the one Mediator, Jesus Christ. It is much *safer*, then, certainly, *not* to pray to the saints, if God has not required us to do so, than to invoke them, especially (as the Roman Catholics do) in the same posture—at the same time—in the same place—and even in the same form of words—as we invoke God Almighty.

"Now, God has nowhere in Scripture required us to invoke the saints. On the contrary, the New Testament seems framed purposely to guard all who are sincerely desirous of following its guidance against such a practice. Though we find, in the book of Acts, narratives of the deaths of the two martyrs, Stephen and James the apostle, the brother of John, there is no mention of their being invoked after death. And when God saw fit to convey his commands to Cornelius, and again to Paul, (Acts x. and xxvii.,) by a created being, it is not one of those blessed martyrs, but an angel that is sent.

"The Virgin Mary, again, is never (but once Acts i. 14) so much as named throughout the Acts and Apostolic Epistles. Now, this silence respecting her is utterly inconceivable, supposing it had been the practice of the early Christians to pray to her. In the Gospels, again, she is but rarely mentioned. And on three of the most remarkable occasions on which she is mentioned, it is apparently on purpose to discourage anything like adoration of her. At the marriage feast at Cana our Lord checks her interference. (John ii. 3, 4.) And on the two other occasions, (Matt. xii. 50; Luke xi. 27,) he takes pains to impress upon his hearers that, in His

sight, the ties of kindred are as nothing in comparison of obedience to God's will."—1 p. 32, 33.

"Another point in which the teaching of the Church of Rome is plainly contrary to Scripture, is *transubstantiation*.

"Roman Catholics hold that, when Christ, at the last Supper, taking the bread in his hands, said, 'This is my body;'—he meant, 'This is no longer bread, but is changed into my body.' Such, they say, is the *natural*, because *literal*, sense of the words.

"(1.) But even if it were the *literal* sense, it would not follow from that that it was the *natural* sense of the words. Because the natural sense is that (whether figurative or literal) in which the persons, who heard him speaking at the time, would *naturally* and reasonably understand his words. For instance, when on the same occasion, our Lord said, 'This cup is the New Testament [covenant] in my blood,' neither the Roman Catholics nor we suppose that He meant to speak literally of the *cup* which he held in his hands: but we both agree that here 'the cup' is put, by a common figure, for the *cup-full of wine*, which the company were drinking. In this case, therefore, we both agree that the *figurative* sense (not the *literal*) is the *natural* meaning of our Saviour's words. Again, if in explaining a map, I were to point to a part of it and say, 'this is France,' no one would think that I meant that a part of that sheet of paper on canvas was *literally* France; that would not be the natural sense of my words. Nor, if I showed you a picture, and said, 'that is the Queen,' would you think I meant to say that it was *literally* Queen Victoria.

"Now it would not have naturally occurred to the apostles, when they heard Christ say of the bread, 'This is my body,' and saw it continue in his hands just the same (to all appearance) as it was before, and when they ate it up, that He was then working a miracle—that He was holding his own body in his own hands, and that they were, each of them, eating up his body, while he sat there all the while conversing with them. But, on the contrary, they would *naturally* have understood Him to be speaking *figuratively*: because they knew that He was then appointing a religious rite; and they (as Jews) were quite accustomed to figurative religious rites. Indeed, they had just been celebrating one such figurative religious rite—the Passover; in which a lamb was eaten, *representing* the lamb which their forefathers had sacrificed on the night they left Egypt; and *bitter* herbs, *representing* the affliction they had been under; and *unleavened* bread, *representing* the hastily-made bread which they took with them in their flight, when there was no time to leaven it. And it is the custom still among the Jews for the master of every household to explain to his family, when eating the Passover, the meaning of the rite; saying, for example, when the bitter herbs are laid on the table, 'This is the food of affliction which our fathers ate in Egypt,' &c. The apostles, therefore, would naturally have understood our Saviour to be, in the same way, explaining the meaning of a figurative rite of His religion, and would have taken him to mean—'This bread *represents*, or stands for, my body,' &c. For such a way of

speaking is quite common, and was often used by our Lord, when explaining figures. So, in explaining the parable of the tares in the field, He says, 'The field is the world—the good seed is the children of the kingdom—the tares are the children of the wicked one—the reapers are the angels,' &c. Meaning that the field of which he had been speaking stood for, or represented, the world; and so of the rest. The apostles, who had often heard Jesus speak thus before, would, therefore, have naturally understood Him to be speaking in the same way then.

"(2.) Did they, then, learn afterwards to put another meaning on His words? On the contrary, we find Paul expressly calling that which is eaten in the communion, 'bread,' even after it has been solemnly set apart as the sign of Christ's body. 'The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body; for we are all partakers of that one bread [loaf.]' (1 Cor. x. 16, 17.) And again:—'As often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, [in a manner unworthy of the solemn rite,] is guilty of [that is, is culpable in respect of] the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup.' (xi. 26, 27, 28.) Where he distinctly explains that it is *because*, in eating the bread and drinking the wine at the communion we *shew forth*—exhibit the representation of the Lord's death, *therefore* he who partakes of it rashly and indecently (as you will find from that chapter the Corinthians did) is guilty of an insult to the Lord's body and blood, not of mere indecorum at a common meal. The Apostle Paul, then, plainly calls what is eaten at the Lord's Supper *bread*, even after it had been made a sign or symbol of the Lord's body. In answer to this the Roman Catholics say, that the apostle speaks *figuratively*, calling it *bread*, because it once was, and still appears so. But it is very strange that men should choose to suspect a figure, in calling that bread, which certainly was, and still seems to all a man's senses to be real bread; and yet not to suspect any figure in calling that Christ's body, which was made by a baker, and neither had nor assumes any resemblance whatever to human flesh.

"(3.) But, indeed, the meaning which they (when they explain themselves) give to Christ's words is not, after all, the *literal* meaning of them. For in common speech we describe things not by their substances (of which we know nothing directly) but by their qualities. We call that bread, which has such a colour, smell, taste, power of nourishing, and so forth. No one would think of calling a mole-hill a mountain, though all the matter of the mountain were pressed into the size of a mole-hill. We should say, in that case, that the mountain had become, or shrunk into, a mole-hill. So, when Moses' rod assumed the appearance of a serpent, it is said that his rod became a serpent; not that a serpent became his rod. Now, according to the Roman Catholics the *substance* of Christ's body in the communion has none of the *attributes* of flesh, but appears under

all the *attributes* of bread. Therefore, in ordinary speech, we should say that Christ's body becomes bread; not that bread becomes Christ's body. To suppose our Lord, when he says, 'This is my body,' to mean 'the *substance* of this bread, without a change in any of its qualities, is changed into the *substance* of my body, only *without* any one outward quality of flesh, is certainly not to suppose Him to speak *literally*, but in the most dark and perplexed (not to say unintelligible) language that ever was uttered. And to say that this is a *natural* and *obvious* meaning of His words, is what scarce any one would venture to say who had not been carefully *trained up* to believe it such."—Pp. 35–37.

These we regard as very successful specimens of the way in which Popish arguments ought to be dealt with, while they are likewise fitted to impress a general consideration of no small importance in the present day, viz., that the discussion even of what may be called the familiar commonplaces of the Popish controversy, affords abundant scope for the exercise of high and varied talent. There is likewise a masterly discussion of the sacrament of penance and the forgiveness of sins, (pp. 39–44,) but it is too long for quotation.

A great deal is done in the present day to bring the case of the Church of Rome before the community in the most taking and plausible dress it can be made to assume. The counteraction of the efforts made for that purpose is a service which requires, and is entitled to, the best talents the community can produce. Popery can be defended with much greater plausibility than those who are imperfectly acquainted with the subject generally suppose. It is not to be disregarded or despised, as if it were so utterly absurd in every point of view as to be unworthy of serious examination. The series of Popish tracts to which Dr. Whately refers, though, of course, full of sophistry and misrepresentation, are yet got up with a good deal of skill and talent, and possess no inconsiderable measure of plausibility. If they were really read by our Protestant population, they would produce an impression and do no little mischief, unless suitable efforts were made to counteract them, and it is no way unbecoming Dr. Whately's talents and position that he should have taken the trouble of exposing them.

It is indeed true that the formidableness of Popery as a system of tenets and practices, and the plausibility with which it can be defended, result chiefly from the foundation which it has in some of the tendencies of human nature. Dr. Whately is fully alive to this important consideration, and has illustrated and applied it in some of its aspects with singular ability and success.

Indeed, his larger work, the "Essays," of which a sort of abridgment or summary is given in the fifth and sixth of the Cautions, is devoted to this subject, and to this chiefly we mean to advert in the remainder of the article.

The rise and growth of the Popish system, and its lengthened and extensive prevalence in the world, are well fitted to excite surprise and astonishment, and form a very interesting subject of investigation. When we survey the system in its full and unrestrained development, as it existed just before the Reformation, and contrast it with the Apostolic Church as exhibited in the New Testament, the conclusion is in a manner forced upon us, that it is fitted if not designed to frustrate the great objects of Christianity as a revelation of God's will while yet professing to acknowledge its divine origin and authority, and to bring back upon the world almost all the evils, in a religious and moral point of view, of the heathenism and the corrupted Judaism that prevailed at the time of our Saviour's appearance upon earth. Polytheism, image-worship, and gross immorality were the great features of heathenism: self-righteousness and superstition or will-worship were the leading features of corrupted Judaism; and these are all to be found in combination as the chief characteristics of Popery when seen in its full development. The history of the world ever since the Fall, makes it manifest that human nature is most prone to all these forms of opposition to God's will and law. All the different revelations which God has given to fallen man were designed to counteract his native tendencies to these things. They succeeded partially, though only partially, in effecting this result. So it was with the revelations which God gave to Adam and his descendants after the fall, to Noah and his sons after the flood, to the people of Israel, through Moses, after the Egyptian captivity, and through the prophets in subsequent generations; and so it has been with the fuller revelation given through Christ and his inspired Apostles. We see, too, under the last dispensation, the old features of heathenism and corrupted Judaism, gradually reviving and expanding, and at length covering, and continuing to do so for a long period, nearly the whole professing Christian Church. The tendency to these things in human nature must be very powerful, when it not only countervailed to so large an extent the Christian revelation, but even contrived, in some measure, to make that very revelation instrumental in producing the result. The Sacred Scriptures plainly describe the bene-

ful effects so extensively produced in all these different circumstances, as traceable, in some measure, to the agency of Satan, and we are persuaded that it is not possible to explain satisfactorily the rise and growth of Popery, viewed as a mere series of historical events, without taking this scriptural principle into account. The prepossessions and tendencies of depraved human nature account for Satan's success in spreading Popery so widely, in preserving it so long, and in giving it so firm a hold in the minds of men; and his unceasing activity accounts for the completeness and consistency of a system which sprung up gradually, from a variety of proximate causes, and through the instrumentality of a number of men, none of whom had a full conception of the whole system in all its bearings.

This is the representation which Scripture gives of Popery, and a knowledge of it is essential to a full understanding of that great mystery of iniquity. It is only one branch of this general representation that is brought out in Dr. Whately's *Essays on the Errors of Romanism* having their origin in human nature. The great object of the work is to shew, that some of the leading general principles or features of the Popish system have their origin in certain tendencies of man's fallen nature, and that of course they are exhibited more or less by mankind in general, by Protestants as well as by Papists; and the great practical lesson which he deduces from this position is, that Protestants ought carefully to guard against them in their own sentiments and conduct. This object is good, and it is in many respects exceedingly well executed. Much important truth is brought out, and illustrated with great acuteness and sagacity. And, in the practical application of the various topics, many important considerations are suggested to Protestants, well fitted to excite them to self-examination, to guard them against errors, sins, and absurdities into which they are prone to fall, and to lead to the exercise of more forbearance and compassion towards the victims of Popish delusion. All this is good and useful; but we think there are defects and omissions in the work which are fitted somewhat to diminish its value. We have no right, of course, to complain that Dr. Whately did not discuss subjects which did not fall directly within the compass of the one important topic which he selected for discussion, and has discussed so well. But there are some erroneous impressions which the perusal of the work is fitted to produce, and which, we think, should have been more carefully and explicitly guarded against.

Where men's attention is fixed through a whole book upon the one position, that the leading features of Popery have their origin in the tendencies of human nature, and therefore exist more or less among mankind in general, among Protestants as well as Romanists, they are apt to rise from it with the impression, that the tenets and practices referred to are not so sinful and dangerous as they formerly conceived them to be. There is nothing in Dr. Whately's book fitted positively to foster this erroneous and injurious impression, but neither is there anything said to guard against it; and this we regard as a defect in the work, though it is not an error to be charged against its author.

Another analogous impression, not unlikely to spring up from the same cause, is this, that since the leading elements of Popery are to be found largely among Protestants, Popery cannot be so *peculiarly* sinful and dangerous as it is sometimes represented to be, and is not, after all, much worse than Protestantism. The great defect of the work is, that this impression is not carefully guarded against, by bringing out the special, peculiar, and paramount guilt and danger of Popery, with reference to the different topics illustrated. We have no right, of course, to impose upon Dr. Whately the task of expounding at length the special guilt and danger of Popery, but we cannot but regard it as a defect in his work, that it contains nothing to guard against the impression, that no very special guilt and danger attach to it—that Protestantism and Popery are not, after all, very different from each other. We think it of so much importance in the present day, that men should fully and accurately understand what Popery is, that we consider it proper to enlarge somewhat upon this topic, and to endeavour to point out in what way the omission or defect we have noticed in Dr. Whately's work ought to be supplied.

The topics which Dr. Whately selects for discussion and illustration are these:—1. Superstition; 2. Vicarious Religion; 3. Pious Frauds; 4. Undue Reliance upon Human Authority; 5. Persecution; and, 6. Trust in Names and Outward Privileges; and on all these subjects the work contains some very important truths, and some very valuable lessons. It is quite true, as he shews at length, that there is a powerful tendency in human nature to all these errors and sins, and that, therefore, they are to be found among Protestants, and in orthodox Protestant churches. But the exposition and application of this general truth are fitted to produce erroneous and dangerous impres-

sions, unless accompanied with something, at least, of what Dr. Whately's work entirely wants, viz., a clear and explicit assertion of the peculiar and paramount guilt and danger of the Popish system, *in all these respects*, as distinguished from the system of Protestantism.

The special and peculiar guilt of Popery in this matter, as distinguished from Protestantism, lies in this, that, as a system, in place of being fitted and designed to eradicate or correct the depraved tendencies of human nature towards superstition, vicarious religion, pious frauds, reliance on human authority, persecution, &c., *it consecrates, confirms and perpetuates them*; whereas the general object and result of Protestantism, as a system, are directly the reverse. The exhibition of these qualities in Protestants is in spite of the system they profess, in Papists it is because of it. We do not mean by this that Popery *originates* or *produces* these tendencies, for they exist, as we have admitted, in depraved human nature as such. But the influence of the Popish system, in so far as it is brought to bear upon them, is to strengthen and establish them, while that of Protestantism is to correct and eradicate them; and, therefore, Popery is to a large extent responsible for the strength with which they act, and the extent to which they operate, among Papists, while Protestantism is *not* responsible for the degree in which they may be exhibited by Protestants.

We have said that the Church of Rome has consecrated and confirmed these depraved tendencies of human nature. She has done so by giving to them, and to their necessary manifestations and results, the sanction, more or less formal and explicit, of the Church, and by providing ceremonies, services, and external arrangements of various kinds, fitted and intended to embody and express them. She has thus given her weight and influence to cherishing and fostering these tendencies in the minds of her people, and to bringing them into full and active operation. We think it worth while to illustrate this general position with reference to some of the leading topics which Dr. Whately has discussed.

1. The first is superstition, a word which is used in a variety of senses, but which is chiefly employed here to designate the tendency to introduce a system of ceremonial observances, to invent or devise unauthorized acts of external worship, and to place some reliance upon them as acceptable to God and fitted to gain his favour, thus virtually comprehending man's natural tendency to idolatry and will-worship. That this tendency exists in the heart of fallen men, has been

proved by the history of religion in all ages, through perhaps never more strikingly than in a case where no idolatry, in the stricter meaning of the word, was admitted. We mean the case of the Pharisees in our Saviour's days, who, though they had a system of minute ceremonial observances imposed by God, such as might have contributed to repress the natural tendency to devise rites and ceremonies by largely gratifying it in a legitimate way, were not satisfied without devising and enforcing many traditions on points of ceremonial observance, and relying upon them as pleasing to God. Now it might seem from the representations of the Christian system and the Christian Church, given us in the New Testament, as if it were one design of the new dispensation to counteract this tendency of human nature, not by providing for it, as under the Mosaic system, a certain amount of legitimate gratification, but by prohibiting and extirpating it. This was manifestly the object of our Saviour, adopted in the exercise of infinite wisdom. Disregard of this object, springing from the tendency of human nature which has been so fully developed in every age, shewed itself at an early period in the Christian Church, and was more and more extensively acted upon as time advanced. Now, how has Popery dealt with this? It has fostered and cherished it to the uttermost, by every species of contrivance which ingenuity could invent. It has introduced practically gods many and lords many, polytheism and image-worship, and thus withdrawn the undivided homage and reliance of men from the one God and the one Saviour. It has fabricated five false sacraments, and ascribed their institution to Christ. It has overloaded the two sacraments which he did institute, with a mass of useless and profane ceremonies, the mere inventions of superstition, and has ascribed to the outward acts and signs effects which Christ and his Apostles never ascribed to them. And, in addition to all this, it has introduced innumerable matters of external ceremony and observance into the worship of God, and urged them upon men as pleasing to him, and beneficial to them. *This* is the peculiar guilt of Popery, this the special danger to which it exposes men in the matter of superstition or will-worship. It has fostered the natural tendency of depraved men by providing for it most abundant, though unlawful gratification, by throwing around all the materials it has provided for the gratification of this sinful and dangerous tendency, the most solemn sanctions of religion, and thus encouraging men to engage in a constant round of idolatrous and superstitious, and therefore sinful

practices, under the delusion that they are thereby propitiating God and meriting his favour.

Now it is quite true that this superstitious tendency being natural to fallen man, indications of its presence and operations sometimes appear among Protestants, and that, therefore, it is right and proper to warn them against it. But the great distinctions that ought to be ever remembered and kept in view, are these:—1st, That the *tendency* of the Popish *system* is to foster and cherish this tendency of depraved human nature, by providing abundant materials for its gratification, and by falsely ascribing to them a divine origin, and a beneficial, if not meritorious, efficacy; whereas, the *tendency* of the Protestant *system*, like that of the Apostles, is to suppress and eradicate it, by prohibiting and discountenancing the inventions of men in the worship of God—by promulgating the great scriptural principle, that nothing ought to be introduced into divine worship which God himself has not sanctioned, and that any deviation in practice from this principle is, in place of being acceptable to God, most offensive in his sight; and 2d, That the practical results of this tendency have been immeasurably more extensively and offensively exhibited in the Church of Rome than ever they have been among Protestants.

Another feature of superstition to which also Dr. Whately adverts under this head, is the natural tendency of men to indulge in unwarranted speculations, and in unfounded hopes and fears, on matters connected with death and the invisible world. And to this the same general observations apply. Popery has laid hold of this tendency, and has made provision for strengthening and confirming it, while the influence of Protestant views is wholly directed to correcting and eradicating it. This may be briefly illustrated, first in regard to death, and then in regard to the invisible world. It seems to be a natural tendency of men when death appears to be approaching, to grasp at some easy, short-hand method of being in some measure prepared for that event and its consequences, and to seek something of the satisfaction of having made this preparation. Now, this tendency is no doubt too often exhibited in a painful and distressing way among ignorant and irreligious persons who call themselves Protestants, by sending for a minister of religion to pray with them on their deathbed,—a service, in some cases inexpressibly painful from the apprehension, not unreasonably entertained, that in spite of full warning the dying sinner may pervert it into a cause or ground of fallacious

hope. But Protestantism is not responsible for this. She has done nothing, either by her doctrines or her practices, to foster or cherish this tendency; they are all directly opposed to it. How different is the case with Popery. She has adroitly laid hold of this natural tendency, and has fabricated the sacrament of extreme unction, without a shadow of scriptural authority, for the purpose of giving it embodiment and expression, thus practically, whatever formal explanations she may give when called upon to defend this doctrine, pandering to an erroneous and dangerous tendency, consecrating and confirming it by religious solemnities, invented for the purpose, or at least taken from a different matter and applied, without reason, to this, and in this way practising a ruinous delusion upon the souls of men.

It is a tendency of human nature to shrink from the idea of men's everlasting condition being irrevocably determined at the period of their death, and to seek for some definite knowledge of what immediately succeeds death, under a vague hope that this may hold out to them some further opportunity of probation, or at least of preparation for happiness. Protestants have adhered to the guidance of the Word of God in giving no countenance or toleration to these dangerous tendencies, and in constantly proclaiming what is the substance of all that God has been pleased to reveal to us upon the subject, viz., that men's eternal destiny is irrevocably determined at the period of their death, and that all men then enter upon a state of happiness or misery, which, in no instance, is ever thereafter to change its general character. Whereas the Church of Rome has, to some extent, adapted her teaching to this erroneous and dangerous tendency of human nature, and holds up before men the intermediate state of purgatory, in which they are to be prepared, by penal inflictions, for the enjoyment of heaven. She has not indeed in this matter so directly contradicted the doctrine of Scripture, as to deny that it is irrevocably settled at the period of men's death whether they are ultimately to go to heaven or to hell; for she teaches that all who are admitted into purgatory reach heaven at last. But no one who is acquainted with human nature, and who duly estimates the natural tendency which we are now considering, will entertain any doubt that the Romish doctrine of purgatory has, in innumerable instances, deadened men's sense of moral responsibility, their appreciation of the certain consequences of death, and led many to cherish the delusive hope, that through a process of posthumous

purgation they would reach heaven at length, when they had no scriptural ground for this expectation. There is a tendency in human nature to desire, and to believe in, an opportunity of purgation after death; and it is an indication of this tendency, that the Jewish Rabbins have also been in the habit of teaching the existence of a purgatory. But they were honest, stupid bunglers compared with the skilful and unscrupulous fabricators of the Popish system; for they have limited the period of men's endurance of the pains of purgatory, in all cases, to twelve months, and they further teach, that nothing can in the mean time be done for them on earth to shorten its duration,*—points of contrast with the Popish doctrine, the bearing of which upon the influence and interests of the priesthood is too obvious to need to be pointed out.

2. We have dwelt, however, long enough upon this subject of superstition, and must now advert to the next topic which Dr. Whately discusses, that of vicarious religion. That there is a tendency in human nature leading men to place some reliance with reference to their future and eternal prospects on the supposed worth and excellence of other men, on what some one or more of their fellow-men have done, are doing, or will do for them, is confirmed by abundant experience. And it cannot be denied that indications of the operation of this most erroneous and dangerous tendency occasionally appear among men who call themselves Protestants. But here, too, Protestantism is free from blame. There is none of her doctrines or practices that has the slightest tendency to encourage this vicarious religion,—the tendency of all of them is directly the reverse. Protestantism holds in the fullest and most unqualified sense, that God alone can forgive sin—that Christ is the only sacrifice, the only priest—that he alone could render any satisfaction to divine justice—that it is solely on the ground of the relation into which men may have been brought to him, and of what He has done or will do for them—that any of them can escape merited punishment or receive any mark of God's favour, and that every man must bear his own burden. And while Protestantism holds all these doctrines in their fullest sense, she teaches nothing which has any tendency to neutralize or modify them, or to obstruct their full practical operation upon men's minds. Whereas the Church of Rome, accommodating herself to this natural tendency of men towards a vicarious religion, and anxious

* Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*, liv. v. c. 17-20.

to devise pretences for encouraging and strengthening it, has invented tenets, and embodied some of them in outward ordinances, the manifest tendency of which is to subvert or neutralize, at least, the practical influence of those great doctrines of God's Word which we have just described as maintained by Protestants. Romanists profess, indeed, to teach all that is laid down in Scripture, upon these subjects, and they do not in words contradict it. But they give such perversions of the Scriptural doctrines, and they join to them so many additions of their own of an *opposite* bearing and tendency, that they can be clearly proved in some points to subvert or contradict them even in argument or speculation, and in other points where perhaps this cannot be made out so plainly, it can at least be shown that their tenets, when viewed in connection with men's natural tendency to a vicarious religion, are well adapted, practically and with reference to the mass of mankind, to confirm it. The Church of Rome teaches that her priests have the power of forgiving sins, and this not only declaratively, but judicially and authoritatively. Romanists acknowledge other mediators besides Christ, not indeed, as they are accustomed to say, other mediators of redemption, but, as they admit, other mediators of intercession. They teach that men may perform works of supererogation, deeds of excellence over and above what may be necessary for securing to themselves admission to heaven without passing through purgatory, and that these works of supererogation may be made available for the spiritual welfare of others than those who performed them, the intervention, however, of some act of the Pope or of his agents being made necessary in order to effect this; and that one man may give satisfaction for another by paying what is due by him in the way of temporal punishment inflicted by God for sin. In short, the Church of Rome teaches explicitly that no one is admitted to "Heaven unless the doors be opened by the priests to whom God has committed the keys."* And not only are all these doctrines explicitly taught as portions of divine truth, but many of them are embodied and exhibited in outward ceremonies and observances, fitted and intended to give them a stronger hold of men's minds, and to make them more practically influential upon their feelings and conduct. Indeed, it may be

said with truth, that the whole aspect and complexion of the Romish system are adapted to, and fitted to strengthen and confirm, the natural tendency of fallen men to a vicarious religion, to a reliance in the matter of their salvation, on those on whom they have no warrant from God to rely. The Church will tell us, and her subjects may repeat the assertion, that they rely only on Christ for salvation; and that there are men in the Church of Rome who are practically and substantially relying on Christ alone, we do not doubt; but where this reliance on Christ alone really exists among them, it is in opposition to the general tendency and the ordinary results of the system of their Church. The manifest tendency of the Romish doctrines above described, is to withdraw them from exclusive reliance upon Christ, and to lead them to trust in their fellow-men. Indeed the sum and substance of Popery, considered practically and as exhibited among the mass of men in countries where it has full and unrestrained operation, is just this, that the priest virtually undertakes to secure the salvation of the people, upon condition that they give themselves up wholly to his guidance, and submit implicitly to his will. Neither priest nor people will openly profess this, or admit it in words; but no one who is familiar with the real sentiments, the practical impressions, and the actual hopes and fears, of the mass of ordinary papists, will deny that this is the actual general result of the system when it is really embraced; and the more carefully men examine the system itself in the light of God's Word, and in connexion with the powerful tendency of depraved human nature to a vicarious religion, the more firmly will they be convinced, that this practical result is one which it is admirably adapted to produce.

3. The next topic which Dr. Whately has discussed is that of pious frauds. And here we fully admit the truth of his leading position, which is this,—

"The tendency to aim at a supposed good end by fraudulent means is not peculiar to the members of the Romish Church, it is not peculiar to those who are *mistaken* in their belief as to what is a good end; it is not peculiar to any sect, age, or country; it is not peculiar to any subject-matter, religious or secular, but it is the spontaneous growth of the corrupt soil of man's heart."—P. 149, 2d edit.

There is a natural tendency in men to act, more or less consciously, upon the principle that the end sanctifies the means, that a desire to effect a good object may justify, or at least palliate, some deviation from the strict rules of integrity and veracity; and

* Ut enim locum aliquem ingredi nemo potest sine ejus opera cui claves commissae sunt, sic intelligimus neminem in coelum admitti, nisi fores a sacerdotibus, quorum fidei claves dominus tradidit, aperiantur.—Cat. Rom. P. ii. c. v. Sec. 57.

some traces of this lurking practical Antinomianism occasionally find their way even into the hearts of pious men. It is on this account right and proper to warn all men against it. But we must not overlook the *peculiar* guilt of Popery in this matter. Protestantism has given no countenance or sanction to this depraved tendency. Protestantism holds no principles, and countenances no practices, that are in any measure fitted to encourage and strengthen it; and it is impossible to find, *to any considerable extent*, in the writings or in the actions of Protestants, examples or defences of its application. Whereas, on the other hand, we are fully entitled to say, that the Romish system is fitted to foster, and has actually fostered, this natural depraved tendency to the practice of pious frauds, and no other warrant is needed for the assertion than these undoubted historical facts:—1st, That Popish writers have more frequently and more explicitly defended the practice than any other body of men that ever existed; and, 2d, That this tendency has been more fully exhibited in actual operation in the Church of Rome than anywhere else. These are facts which can be established by conclusive evidence, and they prove that the Church of Rome is in some way or other chargeable with *peculiar* guilt in sanctioning and fostering this depraved tendency. She is chargeable with those results as to writings and actings which we have described. They are undoubted features of her historical character, and she cannot escape from the guilt which they imply. No productions of heathen or infidel writers exhibit such bold defences of fraud and falsehood as can be produced from the writings of Jesuits. The history of heathenism can produce no such exhibition of every kind and degree of fraud, practised professedly for the advancement of religion, as is unfolded in the history of the Church of Rome, and as can be brought home to the Popish ecclesiastical authorities. This the Sacred Scriptures warrant us to expect to find in the Romish system, and this, accordingly, impartial history fully develops there. This is enough to show that, whenever pious frauds, as indicating a natural tendency of depraved men, are made the subject of discussion in connexion with the errors of Romanism, it is right and necessary to bring out the important and undoubted facts, that Romish writers alone, or nearly so, have defended such frauds, and that Romish ecclesiastics have practised them more extensively than any other body of men who can be comprehended under a specific designation.

But we can not only infer the tendency of

the Popish system to foster the natural tendency of the human heart to practise pious frauds, from the results as exhibited in history, we can lay our hands upon the roots and ingredients of the tendency, as developed in the system itself. These are to be found in the Popish doctrines of the distinction between mortal and venial sins, and of the right of the ecclesiastical authorities to grant dispensations of oaths and vows, doctrines which, whatever glosses or explanations may be given of them for controversial purposes, have a most direct and powerful tendency, especially when viewed in connexion with the natural leanings and inclinations of depraved men, to produce a very inadequate sense of the difference between right and wrong, and to make men regard certain deviations from the laws of integrity and veracity as innocent and harmless. These Romish doctrines, skilfully adapted to men's depraved tendencies, are well fitted, and amply sufficient, to produce *the fraud*, and then the *piety*, such as it is, is furnished in abundance by another feature of the Popish system, viz., the constant and zealous inculcation of the paramount regard due to the prosperity of the Church as an outward visible society, and the obligation to subordinate everything to the promotion of her interests. These features of the Popish system, taken in combination, and viewed in connexion with men's natural tendencies, which they are manifestly fitted to encourage and strengthen, fully explain the undoubted fact, which the history of the Church of Rome presents to our contemplation, viz., that Popish writers have defended, and that Popish ecclesiastics have countenanced and practised, pious frauds, to an immeasurably greater extent than any body of men that ever existed. And this fact contrasts very oddly with the claim which Romanists are accustomed to put forth on behalf of their Church to peculiar and pre-eminent sanctity, as a note by which she is plainly and palpably marked out, even to the eyes of men, as the true and only Church of Christ, amid all the societies which claim to themselves that character.

4. The next topic which Dr. Whately discusses is undue reliance on human authority in religious matters, as connected with the Romish claim to infallibility. His Essay on this subject contains some very valuable and sagacious remarks in support of the position, that the errors of Romanism, speaking generally, were not originally deduced from those texts of Scripture which are now usually brought forward in defence of them, but that after they had sprung up from other causes, and especially the natural tendencies

of the human heart, these texts were pressed into the service. This is a very important truth, and it is well brought out in the following extracts:—

“The infallibility of the (so called) Catholic Church, and the substitution of the decrees of Popes or of pretended General Councils, for the Scriptures, as the Christian’s rule of faith and practice, is commonly regarded as the foundation of the whole Romish system. And it is so, in this sense, that if it be once admitted, all the rest must follow: if the power of ‘binding and loosing’ belong to the Church of Rome in the extent claimed by her, we have only to ascertain what are her decisions, and to comply with them implicitly.

“But I am convinced that this is not the foundation *historically* considered, (though it is *logically*,) of the Romish system;—that the Romish hierarchy did not, in point of fact, first establish their supremacy on a perverted interpretation of certain texts, and then employ the power thus acquired to introduce abuses; but resorted, as occasions led them, to such passages of Scripture as might be wrested to justify the prevailing or growing abuses, and to buttress up the edifice already in great measure reared.”—Pp. 183, 184.

“Whatever slight differences, however, there may be among Protestants as to the precise sense of these passages, and of all that our Lord has said on the subject, they all agree in this—that it will by no means bear the interpretation put on it by the Romanists; who are commonly supposed, as has been above remarked, to derive from their mistaken view of our Lord’s expressions in this place, the monstrous doctrines of the Universal Supremacy of the Church of Rome and her infallibility as to matters of faith. I have said that these doctrines are *supposed* to be thus derived, because there is good reason to think that such is not really the case; and that in this point, as in most of those connected with the peculiarities of Romanism, the mistake is usually committed of confounding cause and effect. When there is any question about any of the doctrines or practices which characterize that Church, it is natural, and it is common, to inquire on what rational arguments, or on what Scriptural authority, these are made to rest; the reasons adduced are examined, and, if found insufficient, the point is considered as settled: and so it is, as far as regards those particular doctrines or practices, when judged of by an intelligent and unbiassed inquirer. That which is indefensible *ought* certainly to be abandoned. But it is a mistake, and a very common, and practically not unimportant one, to conclude, that the *origin* of each tenet or practice is to be found in those arguments or texts which are urged in support of it;—that they furnish the cause, on the removal of which the effects will cease of course—and that when once those reasonings are exploded, and those texts rightly explained, all danger is at an end of falling into similar errors.

“The fact is, that in a great number of instances, and by no means exclusively in questions connected with religion, the erroneous belief or practice has arisen first, and the theory has been devised afterward for its support. Into whatever

opinions or conduct men are led by any human propensities, they seek to defend and justify these by the best arguments they can frame; and then, assigning, as they often do, in perfect sincerity, these arguments, as the cause of their adopting such notions, they misdirect the course of our inquiry. And thus the chance (however small it may be at any rate) of rectifying their errors, is diminished. For if these be in reality traceable to some deep-seated principle of our nature, as soon as ever one false foundation on which they have been placed is removed, another will be substituted; as soon as one theory is proved untenable, a new one will be devised in its place. And in the mean time, we ourselves are liable to be lulled into a false security against errors whose real origin is to be sought in the universal propensities of human nature.”—Pp. 187–190.

“Again, if the Romanists are urged to defend and explain their practice of praying for the souls of the departed, they refer us to the doctrines of their Church respecting Purgatory. But it is not really the doctrine of Purgatory which led to prayers for the dead; on the contrary, it is doubtless the practice of praying for the dead that gave rise to that doctrine—a doctrine which manifestly savours of having been invented to serve a purpose. Accordingly it never, I believe, found its way into the Greek Church; though the use of prayers for the dead (difficult as it is to justify such a practice on other grounds) has long prevailed in that Church no less than in the Romish.

“If, again, we call on the Romanists to justify their invocation of saints, which seems to confer on these the divine attribute of omnipresence, they tell us that the Almighty miraculously reveals to the glorified saints in heaven the prayers addressed to them, and then listens to their intercession in behalf of the supplicants. But the real state of the case, doubtless, is, that the practice which began gradually in popular superstition, and was fostered and sanctioned by the mingled weakness and corruption of the priesthood, was afterwards supported by a theory too unfounded and too extravagantly absurd to have ever obtained a general reception, had it not come in aid of a practice already established, and which could be defended on no better grounds.

“And the same principle will apply to the greater part of the Romish errors; the cause assigned for each of them will in general be found to be in reality its effect;—the arguments by which it is supported to have gained currency from men’s partiality for the conclusion. It is thus that we must explain, what is at first sight so great a paradox, the vast difference of effect apparently produced in minds of no contemptible powers, by the same arguments;—the frequent inefficacy of the most cogent reasonings, and the hearty satisfaction with which the most futile are often listened to and adopted. Nothing is, in general, easier than to convince one who is prepared and desirous to be convinced; or to gain any one’s full approbation of arguments tending to a conclusion he has already adopted; or to refute triumphantly in his eyes any objections brought against what he is unwilling to doubt. An argument which shall have made one convert, or even settled

one really doubting mind, though it is not of course necessarily a sound argument, will have accomplished more than one which receives the unhesitating assent and loud applause of thousands who had already embraced, or were predisposed to embrace, the conclusion."—Pp. 191–193.

"It is, on many accounts, of great practical importance to trace, as far as we are able, each error to its real source. If, for instance, we supposed the doctrine of Transubstantiation to be really founded, as the Romanists pretend, and as, no doubt, many of them sincerely believe, on the words 'This is my body,' we might set this down as an instance in which the language of Scripture, rashly interpreted, has led to error. Doubtless there *are* such instances; but I can never believe that this is one of them; viz., that men really were *led* by the words in question to believe in Transubstantiation; for besides the intrinsic improbability of such an error having so arisen, we have the additional proof, that the passage was before the eyes of the whole Christian world for ten centuries before the doctrine was thought of. And again, if we suppose the doctrine to have, in fact, arisen from the misinterpretation of the text, we shall expect to remove the error by shewing reasons why the passage should be understood differently: a very reasonable expectation, where the doctrine has *sprung from the misinterpretation*; but quite otherwise, where, as in this case, the *misinterpretation has sprung from the doctrine*. When there was a leaning in men's minds towards the reception of the tenet, they of course looked for the best confirmation of it (however weak) that Scripture could be made to afford.

"There is no instance, however, that better exemplifies the operation of this principle, than the one immediately before us—the Romish doctrines of the Universal Supremacy, and Infallibility, of their Church. If we inquire how the Romanists came so strangely to mistake the passages of Scripture to which they appeal, we shall be utterly bewildered in conjecture, unless we read backwards the lesson imprinted on their minds, and seek for the true cause in the natural predisposition to look out for, and implicitly trust, an infallible guide; and to find a refuge from doubts and dissensions, in the unquestioned and unlimited authority of the Church. This indeed *had* been gradually established, and vested in the Romish See, before it was distinctly claimed. Men did not submit to the authority, because they were convinced it was of divine origin and infallible; but, on the contrary, they were convinced of this, because they were disposed and accustomed so to submit. The tendency to 'teach for doctrines the commandments of men,' and to acquiesce in such teaching, is not the effect, but the cause of their being taken for the commandments of God."—Pp. 195–197.

There is a natural tendency in men to rely on the authority of others in religious matters; and indifference, laziness, and timidity,—influential elements of character, taken as a whole, in the mass of mankind,—all go to strengthen this tendency, if they

may not rather be said to constitute and produce it. There is a desire natural to men, of some easy and expeditious way of getting rid of their doubts and difficulties, and attaining, without much trouble or research, to some authoritative foundation on which they think they may securely rest. This tendency is fitted to lead to error and danger, because the Word of God does not sanction it, and makes no provision for men attaining, in this way, to a certain knowledge of the truth; while, from the numerous temptations to error which beset men from without and from within, those who indulge this tendency, and the elements out of which it grows, will be very apt to go astray, and to become the prey of designing men, who may advance unfounded but plausible claims to the submission and obedience of their understandings. Protestantism is decidedly opposed to this erroneous and dangerous tendency. It not only does not appeal to it, or seek to derive from it any advantage, but its principles, based upon the Word of God, tend directly to counteract and eradicate it, by urging the necessity of men coming into direct and immediate contact with God himself and his Word in the matter of their salvation, and by denying, openly and fully, that the exercise of any authority, properly so called, in religious matters, is lawful, or that God has appointed any man, or body of men, whose decisions on these subjects are to be implicitly obeyed. The Church of Rome, on the other hand—and here lies her peculiar guilt in this matter, while it is one chief means by which she has kept men under her sway and gained many to submit to her claims—has skilfully pandered to this natural tendency of men, has given it the fullest and most solemn sanction, has habitually availed herself of its influence, and made the most ample provision for strengthening, by exercising it. In endeavouring to establish the general position, that it is desirable and necessary that there should be a permanent judge authorized to settle all controversies in religion, the Romanists commonly appeal not to Scripture—for it affords no countenance to the idea—but just to this very tendency of human nature, and to those low and grovelling influences to which we formerly referred, as encouraging, if not producing it. In laying down the general position, that infallibility is necessary in order to the right execution of what are generally admitted to be the ordinary proper functions of the Church as an organized society, and of the Christian ministry collectively considered, including the decision of religious controversies, they *are*

skilfully addressing themselves to the same general tendency, and making the fullest provision for gratifying and confirming it. And that this is one of the ultimate objects or final causes of the claim which they put forth to infallibility, is *not* disproved by the partial inconsistency into which some Papists have been led by their disputes among themselves as to the seat of infallibility, viz., the assertion that the decisions of the Pope, as undoubted head of the Church, are to be obeyed by all the faithful, whether he be personally infallible or not.

Here, again, we see the peculiar guilt of the Popish system, and the special danger with which it is attended. Men, ignorant and depraved men, have a strong natural tendency to place an undue reliance upon human authority in religious matters. God guards us against this tendency in his Word, by discountenancing all reliance upon mere human authority, by appointing no authoritative judge of religious controversies, and giving no hint of the desirableness or necessity of such a provision, by requiring men to come into immediate contact with his own Spirit and Word, that they may correctly and certainly know his mind and will, and by demanding that every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. The Church of Rome sets itself in opposition to all this, takes this erroneous and dangerous tendency of depraved human nature under its fostering care, gives it all the sanction of its authority by holding it up as a principle of religion, encouraging men's indifference, sloth, and cowardice by persuading them to act upon it, and thus contrives to lead many men, without almost any sense of responsibility, without any careful examination, and with scarcely any knowledge of the grounds on which they are proceeding, to give themselves up to dangerous error. The iniquity of the Popish system in this respect, may be regarded as exhibited in a concentrated and practical form in the simple and well-known fact, that the Popish authorities are in the habit of circulating in this country a pamphlet called "The Duke of Brunswick's Fifty Reasons for embracing the R. C. religion," and that the last of his reasons is expressed in these words:—"The Catholics to whom I spoke concerning my conversion, assured me that if I were to be damned for embracing the Catholic faith, they were ready to answer for me at the day of judgment, and to take my damnation upon themselves—an assurance I never could extort from the ministers of any sect, in case I should live and die in their religion. Whence I inferred that the Roman

Catholic faith was built upon a better foundation than any of these sects that have divided from it."*

It is right to warn Protestants and all men against undue reliance upon human authority in religious matters, for none are free from danger in this respect; but it is not right to overlook the special and pre-eminent guilt which the Popish system, as distinguished from the Protestant, has incurred in this matter, and the peculiar danger with which its influence is attended.

5. The fifth topic which Dr. Whately discusses, in illustration of the general principles of his book, is persecution. It is fully conceded, that there is a tendency in human nature to persecute because of differences of opinion upon religious subjects, to treat these differences as injuries or insults to ourselves, and to punish them as such; and then this natural tendency is often strengthened and confirmed by erroneous and perverted impressions of the obligations under which men lie to God and to His truth, and of the way in which these obligations ought to be discharged. There is scarcely any one of the errors of Romanism that has a deeper foundation in human nature than this, or any one which more readily allies itself with some of the better feelings of our nature, and which can produce a larger amount of apparent, though only apparent, countenance from Scripture. And accordingly there was no one of the errors and evil tendencies of the Romish system that adhered more firmly, or for a longer period to Protestants, than this. But while it is admitted that this tendency to persecute is natural to men, and has been often exhibited in practical operation by Protestants as well as Papists, and while on this account it is right that *all* men should be warned against yielding to its influence, we should not overlook the special and peculiar guilt of Popery with reference to this, as well as all the other depraved tendencies of human nature.

Now, the first and most obvious consideration which presents itself in illustration of this, is in substance the same as that which we adduced under the head of *pious frauds*, viz., that Papists have more openly and generally defended, and more extensively and recklessly practised persecution, than Pro-

* This is copied from an edition of the pamphlet published at London in 1822 by Keating and Brown. It continues in great repute and general circulation. It is given entire, filling sixty pages, as an appendix to the first volume of a Popish work of great pretensions, published at Paris in 1847, entitled "Lettres au Clergé Protestant d'Allemagne," by Monseigneur Luquet, Evêque d'Hesbon.

testants, or any other body of men, have done, from which we infer that the Popish system is better adapted to encourage and strengthen this natural tendency than the Protestant or any other system. Protestants have seldom if ever been guilty of wholesale murders of large masses of human beings professedly upon mere grounds of religion, while these atrocities are common in the history of the Church of Rome. Protestants, even when most deeply imbued with this deplorable error, have usually restricted their violence to heresiarchs, or to ringleaders in heresy, whom they regarded as leading other men astray; while Papists have been accustomed to make scarcely any distinction between the misleaders and the misled, and to involve as far as they could all who they thought had gone astray from truth in one common destruction. Protestants have never been guilty of the folly and absurdity of compelling men to embrace the true religion, as if a mere external profession of what was right could be really honouring to God or beneficial to men,—their sin in this matter has been restricted to punishing and removing out of the way individuals who they thought were extensively injuring the souls of others; while Papists have been in the habit of disregarding these distinctions, overleaping these barriers, and persecuting men in masses, avowedly for the purpose of forcing them into the true fold of Christ.

These are great aggravations of the iniquity of Romanists, as distinguished from that of Protestants, in regard to this matter of persecution, and confirm the inference we have drawn, that the Popish system must be peculiarly adapted to call forth and to strengthen this natural tendency of depraved men, and to give it an extensive influence over their conduct. This is enough for our purpose, even if we could not point any specific features in the Popish system on which this peculiar fitness to call forth, to encourage, and to strengthen, men's natural tendency to persecute, was based. But there is no difficulty in doing this. The principle of subordinating everything to the interests of the Church, as a visible organized society, has just as strong a tendency to produce persecution as to produce pious frauds; and the virtual substitution of the visible Church in the room and stead of Christ, which is a leading feature of the Popish system, is well fitted to consecrate and to confirm this tendency. The supposed possession of infallibility tends to produce in men a reckless disregard of the claims and rights of others, and a pressing, at all hazards and against all opposition, of their own. The notion that

opposition to the Church involves a forfeiture *de jure* of ordinary civil rights and privileges, of property and life, has been long deeply ingrained in their system, and has been acted upon whenever, and in so far as, circumstances seemed to render it expedient; while their notions about the bearing and consequences of external communion with the true visible Church, have no doubt seemed to them to give a sanction to persecuting proceedings, which would otherwise have been seen to be foolish and absurd, and which, as we have explained, no Protestants have ever adopted. It will not do, then, to slur over this matter of persecution, as is now-a-days a common and fashionable practice, merely by saying that there is a strong tendency in human nature to persecute, and that Protestants have persecuted as well as Papists. This is true, but it is not the whole truth, and it is right that on this point, as on every other, we should bring out the peculiar guilt and danger of the Popish system as distinguished from the Protestant,—of the Church of Rome as distinguished from Protestantism,—in cherishing and fostering the depraved tendencies of human nature, instead of mortifying and subduing them, and, as a consequence of this, in exhibiting in point of fact far more extensively their baneful and ruinous operation, both on the temporal and spiritual welfare of men.

There is nothing in Dr. Whately's Essays on Romanism inconsistent with the representations we have now given of the system, and we have no reason to doubt that he would concur in the whole substance of what we have said. But we cannot but regard it as a defect in the work, that some little pains was not taken to guard against the impression, not unlikely to be produced by it, that Popery is not very much less safe and innocent than Protestantism, and that there is not even an *assertion* of the peculiar and pre-eminent guilt of Popery in reference to the topics discussed.

In addition to this general defect, there is a more specific omission of a somewhat peculiar kind, in the non-introduction of what is commonly known by the name of self-righteousness in its bearing upon the doctrine of justification. The general omission on which we have animadverted is not mentioned or referred to by Dr. Whately, probably because it was not very directly suggested by the leading object which he proposed to himself in the composition of the work. The discussion, however, of the topic of self-righteousness, according to the views generally entertained of it by the Reformers and by Calvinistic and Evangelical divines, lay so directly in the line of the course of

investigation to which the work is devoted, that it was scarcely possible to omit it, without adverting to the omission and giving some explanation of its cause. Accordingly Dr. Whately has devoted the Appendix B to an exposition of his views upon the subject of self-righteousness, and of the reasons why he did not discuss it in the body of the work, as an illustration of the "errors of Romanism having their origin in human nature." This appendix we regard as containing no small amount of serious error, and as manifesting something less than Dr. Whately's usual candour and fairness. We do not deny that there have been instances among those who have held the doctrine of the Reformers with respect to justification and self-righteousness, in which that latent and insidious spiritual pride, which he exposes, has been manifested, and we willingly acknowledge that there are some of his statements upon this subject from which these persons may learn some useful lessons of warning. But we consider it unwarrantable to make statements, as he seems to do, fitted to convey the impression, that this is the natural tendency and the appropriate result of the views on this point which he opposes, and that it characterizes generally those who advocate them. The most important question, however, connected with this subject, is as to the soundness and accuracy of his reasons for omitting to give a distinct and prominent consideration to the subject of self-righteousness, meaning thereby, an undue and unwarrantable reliance upon our own good deeds as a means of obtaining the forgiveness of sin and the enjoyment of God's favour. The substance of what he lays down on this point may, we think, be fairly enough comprehended in these two propositions,—1st, That a tendency to self-righteousness, in the sense above explained, is neither very common nor very dangerous, and, 2d, that the Romanists teach no very material error upon this subject, "though they may perhaps have made an injudicious use of the word *merit*."

The examination of these positions would open up a wide field of theological discussion, on which we cannot at present enter. But we must say, that we regard the maintenance of them as amounting to a virtual denial of the great doctrine of justification as taught by the Reformers and by the Apostle Paul, and as a deplorable specimen of the anti-scriptural views in regard to it which have generally prevailed in the Church of England since the time of Bishop Bull. There was no subject on which the Reformers were so unanimous, or to which they attached so much importance, as the doctrine

of justification, including the exposition of the place which good works hold in the scheme of salvation. Lutherans, Calvinists, and Anglicans, at the period of the Reformation, were all persuaded that the Church of Rome taught very serious error upon this subject, and they were of one mind as to what was the doctrine taught in Scripture concerning it. If Dr. Whately's opinions upon this subject are correct, the Reformation, in the very matter to which its authors attached the highest importance, must have been founded wholly in misapprehension and error. For more than a century after the commencement of the Reformation, the divines of the Church of England continued to believe that the Church of Rome had very materially perverted the doctrine of Scripture upon this point. This is evident from two great works in which this subject is minutely investigated, viz., Bishop Davenant's "*Praelectiones de Justitia habituali et actuali*," published in 1631, and Bishop Downam's "*Treatise of Justification*," published in 1633. In these two works, the best and fullest scholastic discussions of this subject which Britain has produced, it is proved that the Church of Rome teaches very material and dangerous error in regard to the place which men's good deeds hold in the scheme of salvation, while, incidentally, it also appears from them, that the defenders of the doctrine of the Reformation upon this topic, had Papists for their only antagonists, and met with no opposition from any of their own brethren. When Protestants began to corrupt the doctrine of Scripture and of the Reformation, by inculcating those views on the subject of justification which Dr. Whately maintains, the Papists raised a shout of triumph, and adduced the fact as a concession, at length extorted by the force of truth, to the effect, that there was no very material difference upon this point between Protestants and the Church of Rome, and that of course one fundamental article in the theology of the Reformers was based upon misrepresentation and falsehood.*

Ever since the time of Bishop Bull, very erroneous views upon the subject of justification have been widely prevalent in the Church of England—views in substance the same as those taught by the Church of Rome. Those who hold these views cannot but admit, as Dr. Whately does, that the Church

* A proof of the truth of this statement, and an interesting specimen of the use made by Romish controversialists of the renunciation by Protestants of the doctrine of the Reformers on the subject of justification, will be found in the work of the celebrated Jansenist Nicole, entitled "*Préjugés Légitimes contre les Calvinistes*," c. xi. p. 270-6.

of Rome teaches no very material error upon this subject, and, of course, must maintain, if they would speak out, that the Reformers were defeated in argument by the Romanists, in that very matter which they reckoned the article of a standing or a falling church. It is true that the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent upon this subject, are drawn up with a good deal of caution and cunning, and are well fitted to deceive those who have not thoroughly investigated it. But in the writings of the two great divines to whom we have referred, and in those of other old divines of the Church of England who might be mentioned, it is proved, we think, beyond the possibility of answer, that the Church of Rome does teach very serious error upon this important subject; and that the general scope and tendency of all the error she teaches, is just to cherish and foster self-righteousness in men's minds, that is, to lead them to place a reliance upon their own good works as a means of obtaining forgiveness of sin and the favour of God, which the Sacred Scriptures not only do not sanction, but condemn and denounce. The history of religion in every age and country seems to us to make it manifest, that there is in human nature a powerful tendency leading men to place a measure of reliance upon their own good deeds—their own compliance with the laws of morality—as a means of obtaining pardon and acceptance from God, which is clearly precluded by the whole substance of what is taught in Scripture, concerning men's natural state of guilt and sinfulness, and concerning the remedy which has been provided for it. And the truth of this position is in no degree invalidated by the truth of another, viz., that men have a strong natural tendency to rely unduly, with the same view, upon their external religious observances, and, even to substitute the observance of religious ceremonies for the performance of moral duties. These two tendencies are perfectly consistent with, and mutually auxiliary to, each other. And in adducing and establishing against the Church of Rome, the charge of fostering and cherishing men's natural tendency to self-righteousness, we have no difficulty in shewing that it encourages men to rely unduly and unwarrantably *both* on good works or external conformity to the moral law, and on outward ceremonies. It does the former by its anti-scriptural doctrines as to the meaning, the nature, the causes, and the grounds of justification, and by an error on the subject of the *merit* of good works, going very far beyond what Dr. Whately calls, "the *perhaps* injudicious use of a word." It does the latter by inventing and imposing a host of

unauthorized rites and ceremonies, and teaching men to regard them as conveying and conferring grace. There is perhaps no more striking proof of the strength of this tendency than its prevalence in a large section of professedly Christian and Protestant society. If we investigate the state of mind of the great body of those whom we see around us in the world, not the openly profligate but the externally decent, we will be satisfied, that the more ignorant they are of religion, and the more indifferent they are habitually to all their responsibilities and obligations as immortal beings, the more are they disposed to rely upon their own good deeds, or external observances, as a ground of hope towards God.

There is, then, in human nature, a powerful tendency to self-righteousness. The Popish system, in place of seeking to eradicate this, as evangelical Protestantism does, is fitted to confirm and extend it. And there is no one aspect in which Popery can be contemplated, better fitted to illustrate its injurious bearing upon the spiritual welfare of men, than when we survey those of its tenets and practices above referred to, in connexion with that tendency of human nature to which they are so skilfully accommodated. The Apostle Paul seems to have found this strong natural tendency of men to self-righteousness, to be the great obstacle to the success of his labours; and the experience of most men who have rightly understood the real nature of the Apostle's object, and who have adopted *his* method of seeking to effect it, has been of a similar kind. It was this tendency to self-righteousness, that was most influential in making the preaching of Christ crucified a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Greeks. It is still true, we fear, in regard to multitudes to whom Christianity has been made known, that "they being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." (Rom. x. 3.) And this statement of the Apostle's applies perhaps more fully and emphatically to the victims of Popish delusion, than to any class of men within whose reach Christianity has been brought. The whole system is fitted to keep them in ignorance of God's righteousness, to encourage them to go about to establish their own righteousness, and thereby to prevent them from submitting unto God's righteousness, the only scheme or provision by which sinners can be saved. If there be any principle better entitled than all others to a place in an exposition of the depraved tendencies of human nature in which the errors of Romanism

originate, and if there be any error of Romanism against which it is peculiarly important to warn Protestants, it is self-righteousness, or an undue reliance upon good works and religious observances as a means of procuring forgiveness and acceptance from God.

There is one of Dr. Whately's colleagues on the Irish episcopal bench, who holds what are, in our judgment, much more Scriptural views on the subject of justification and good works, and the relation in which they stand to each other, viz., Dr. O'Brien, Bishop of Ossory. Dr. O'Brien has rendered an important service to what we believe to be the cause of truth in this matter, in his work entitled "*An Attempt to Explain and Establish the Doctrine of Justification by Faith only.*" The revival in the Church of England of the scriptural doctrine of the Reformers upon this important subject, has found in Dr. O'Brien a worthy representative and advocate. His work is an able and learned defence of what we believe to be the true doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures, of the whole body of the Reformers, and of the authors of the symbolical books of the Church of England, upon the subject of justification. It is peculiarly valuable to the theological student, because of the fulness with which it adduces the evidence, that the Reformers unanimously maintained, in opposition to the Romanists, those views upon that subject which have been generally rejected by the divines of the Church of England, ever since Bishop's Bull's time.*

Dr. Whately in a note to the above-mentioned Appendix, (pp. 368, 369,) gives a brief indication of the general method by which he would attempt to show that the Apostle Paul, in his Epistle to the Romans, did not teach the doctrine on the subject of justification which the Reformers deduced from his statements, and plainly hints, that by the very same process it might be shown, that the Reformers did not teach the doctrines which have been generally ascribed to them, by those who have most highly valued, and most carefully studied, their writings. It is in substance this, that the Apostle, in discussing the subject of justification, was dealing with men who did not place their reliance for pardon and acceptance upon their good works properly so called, upon the performance of moral duties, upon any conformity, even in external action, to the moral law, but merely upon

ceremonial observances, and that the Reformers had to do with a similar class of persons and of notions. He says,

"The error which is perhaps the commonest among Protestants upon this point, is that of forgetting that the 'works' by which the Pharisees sought to establish their own righteousness, 'which was of the law,' were not the performance of moral duties, but ceremonial observances."—P. 368.

And again,—

"An error very nearly the same had crept in among us to a vast extent before the Reformation. 'Good works' had come to signify principally, if not exclusively, pilgrimages, fasts, genuflexions, and ceremonial observances of various kinds; and hence our Reformers use much the same language as the Apostle Paul, with the same meaning, and on a like occasion."—P. 369.

The notion which Dr. Whately seems to intend to convey by these statements is, that *the works* which Paul and the Reformers so absolutely excluded from the matter of justification, to which they so strenuously denied all justifying efficacy, were merely ceremonial observances. He admits, indeed, that "to found a claim to immortal happiness, on the ground of immorality of life, would have been an error," and that both Paul and the Reformers "were well aware that virtuous actions can never give a man a claim to the Christian promises, independently of Christian faith; and also that the best actions—in themselves the best—are not acceptable in God's sight, (indeed, are not even morally virtuous at all,) independently of the principle from which they spring." But these are statements to which no Romanist would object; and we are not at present considering the whole subject of justification, or Dr. Whately's views concerning it, but merely adverting to the interpretation he puts upon a portion of the language employed by Paul and the Reformers, in treating of it. And with reference to this point, we regard as fully warranted the statement we have made, viz., that he is of opinion, that the works to which Paul and the Reformers so strenuously denied all justifying efficacy were ceremonial observances. It is well known that this is one of the interpretations which have been proposed and advocated, for the purpose of showing that Paul taught the doctrine of the Church of Rome, and not the doctrine of the Reformers, upon the subject of justification. We have no hesitation in saying, that we regard it as the most indefensible of all the misrepresentations of the Apostle's language that have been put forth with that view.

* This very valuable work of Dr. O'Brien's is out of print, and cannot be procured. Why is it not reprinted? What has become of Dr. O'Brien's promised History of the Doctrine of Justification? This is a noble subject, and in his hands would be most useful and interesting.

We cannot at present discuss this matter upon its merits; but we think it right to state, that this interpretation of the Apostle's language has been generally rejected by the more judicious of those, whether Romanists or Protestants, who have concurred in the main in Dr. Whately's opinions on the subject of justification. Cardinal Bellarmine, in treating of this point, says, "Some Catholics teach that, by the *works* which the Apostle excludes from justification, must be understood the observance of legal ceremonies, circumcision, the Sabbath, new moons, &c. But it is the uniform opinion of St. Augustine, and without doubt it is most true, that by works which are opposed to faith, and are excluded from justification, must be understood the works which precede faith, and are performed by the mere power of free will." (*De Justif. lib. l. c. xix.*) *Bishop Bull's leading positions upon the subject are these:—1st, That by *works* the Apostle understood obedience to the whole Mosaic law; 2d, That in discussing the Mosaic law as a whole, and showing that obedience to it could exert no efficacy in procuring justification, he at the same time exposes some Jewish dogmas which had been combined with it; and, 3d, That as he had also to do with the Gentile philosophers, he argues also against the works of the natural law, or obedience rendered to the moral law by the mere powers of nature, without divine grace, though he does this only incidentally, and by the by. (*Harmonia Apostolica Disser. ii. c. vi., pp. 93–100.*) It seems to us very manifest, that the works which Paul excludes from any efficacy in procuring justification, include all this *at least*; nay, we have no doubt it has been proved, that they include not merely obedience to the whole law of Moses, the moral as well as the ceremonial part of it, not merely works externally conformed to the moral law proceeding from men's natural powers without faith or grace, but also, moreover, absolutely and universally, obedience to law as law, conformity to legal requirements as such. All this, we believe, the Apostle excludes from the matter of justification—to all this he denies any efficacy in procuring for men the forgiveness of their sins and the enjoyment of God's favor.

The chief grounds on which Dr. Whately

seems to found the interpretation he gives of the Apostle's language are, that he was disputing with the Pharisees, that therefore his words must be understood only in the sense which the work of refuting them requires, and that they were openly immoral men, who did not profess to rely upon their good works or external morality, but only on ceremonial observances. We object both to the general principle of interpretation indicated in this mode of arguing, and to the application which is here made of it. We do not deny the importance of ascertaining as fully as possible the precise and immediate object which the inspired writers had in view, in the statements they made upon any occasion, and the propriety of applying this for the purpose of bringing out the meaning and bearing of what they may have said. But we maintain that there is no improbability in the idea, that men, whether inspired or uninspired, may, in discussing a particular subject, be led on to make statements more wide and comprehensive than what the precise topic with which the discussion started obviously suggested, or necessarily required, and that they may use language, in the course of the discussion, so plain as to make the fact that they had been led to do this, altogether unquestionable. We believe that the Apostle's language so clearly and certainly excludes from the ground of justification obedience to the whole Mosaic law *at least*, that we would feel ourselves constrained to ascribe this doctrine to him, even though he had commenced his argument by expressly telling us, that he was about to expose the reliance which the Pharisees placed on ceremonial observances. But there is no ground whatever for believing that this was his sole or even his principal object. He was dealing not so much with the practice as with the doctrine of the Pharisees, and we have conclusive evidence that they professed to rely for acceptance with God upon their obedience to the whole Mosaic law, and taught that this was a legitimate and valid ground of confidence. The application which Paul makes of his own case and character while a Pharisee, ought to have precluded the whole process of thought on which Dr. Whately grounds his misinterpretation of the Apostle's language.*

* Tam hoc manifestum est, ut cum olim nonnulli ex Romanæ ecclesiæ addictis hac exceptione usi sint, Paulum, Rom. iii. 28, alibique, opera solum legis caeremonialis a justificatione excludere, recentiores tamen, quam parum illi insit roboris animadvertentes, aliam hinc se expediendi ingressi sunt viam. J. F. Buddæi Ecclesia Apostolica, c. iii. s. iii. p. 151.

* For a full investigation of the erroneous notions on the subject of justification and good works that generally prevailed in the Apostolic age, both among Jews and Gentiles, and for a conclusive proof, as we think, that all that can be ascertained upon this point, confirms decidedly the interpretation put upon Paul's language by the Reformers, we refer to two eminent divines, the first a Calvinist, and the second a Lutheran, Witsius and Buddæus. See Witsius's Miscel-

Dr. Whately's statement, that "our reformers used much the same language as the Apostle Paul, with the same meaning, and on a like occasion," is plainly intended to convey the notion that the "good works" which they excluded from all efficacy in procuring forgiveness and acceptance, were merely outward ceremonial observances. This notion we believe to be entirely unfounded, to be wholly inconsistent both with the historical facts as to what they had to oppose in the Church of Rome, where the meritorious efficacy of repentance and moral duties in procuring the Divine favour was openly proclaimed, and with the true and plain meaning of their own statements as to what they intended to teach.

There is one other feature in Dr. Whately's Essays which we would like to notice, though we have not now space to dwell upon it. He presents an interesting and important view of the Popish system in the following passage:—

"The peculiar character of Romanism (and also of the religion of the Greek Church) in this respect, will be best perceived by contrasting it with Mahometism. This latter system was framed, and introduced, and established, within a very short space of time, by a deliberately-designing impostor; who did indeed most artfully accommodate that system to man's nature, but did not wait for the gradual and spontaneous operations of human nature to produce it. He reared at once the standard of proselytism, and imposed on his followers a code of doctrines and laws ready-framed for their reception. The tree which he planted did indeed find a congenial soil; but he planted it at once, with its trunk full-formed and its branches displayed. The Romish system, on the contrary, rose insensibly like a young plant from the seed, making a progress scarcely perceptible from year to year, till at length it had fixed its root deeply in the soil, and spread its baneful shade far around.

In secunda quidem, sed læta et fortia surgunt;
Quippe sola natura subest;

it was the natural offspring of man's frail and corrupt character, and it needed no sedulous culture. No one, accordingly, can point out any precise period at which this 'mystery of iniquity'—the system of Romish and Grecian corruptions—first began, or specify any person who introduced it. No one, in fact, ever did introduce any such system. The corruptions crept in one by one; originating the most part with an ignorant and depraved people, but connived at, cherished, consecrated, and successively established by a debased and worldly-minded ministry; and modified by them just so far as might best favour the views of their secular ambition. But the system thus gradually com-

packed, was not the deliberate contrivance of any one man or set of men, adepts in priestcraft, and foreseeing and designing the entire result. The corruptions of the unreformed Church were the natural offspring of human passions, not checked and regulated by those who ought to have been ministers of the Gospel, but who, on the contrary, were ever ready to indulge and encourage men's weakness and wickedness, provided they could turn it to their own advantage. The good seed 'fell among thorns,' which, being fostered by those who should have been occupied in rooting them out, not only 'sprang up with it,' but finally choked and overpowered it."—Pp. 7-9.

There is, no doubt, a great deal of truth in this passage, and in others to the same effect which occur in different parts of the work. But we are disposed to think that the statement as a whole is somewhat exaggerated, and to assign a larger share of influence to the priesthood in devising and fabricating the Popish system. Not only did the priests share equally in the same natural tendencies which led the people to desire and to welcome the system of tenets and practices which constitutes Popery, but they were, for many reasons, much more likely to give to the appropriate results of these tendencies the fullest expression and the most ample encouragement. It is a view of Popery that ought never to be overlooked, that its tenets and practices, individually and collectively, though they have their origin in human nature, are also admirably adapted to increase the influence and promote the selfish interests of the priesthood, a fact which indicates pretty plainly the source to which their growth and development are to be mainly ascribed. And there is another view of Popery that ought never to be forgotten, viz., that all its peculiar tenets and practices, while having their origin in human nature, and while fitted and designed to increase the influence of the priesthood, are also adapted to lead men to form erroneous views of the doctrines inculcated and the duties enjoined in the Sacred Scriptures. They thus tend to prevent men from making a right use and improvement of the Revelation which God has given them, and in this way to endanger their spiritual and eternal welfare. There are thus three leading general views of Popery, all of which must be taken into account in order that we may thoroughly understand and appreciate that most marvellous system. Its tenets and practices have their origin in certain tendencies of human nature, and this view is fitted to impress those useful practical lessons which Dr. Whately has so well illustrated. They are all fitted, equally and at once, to promote the two great objects of

advancing the influence of the priesthood and endangering men's spiritual welfare. The most remarkable thing in the history of Popery is, that, gradually, during a long series of years, and through the labours of many individuals, not acting on a preconcerted plan, a system should have grown up, which is admirably compacted and thoroughly consistent in all its parts, and which, in all its provisions and arrangements, the most minute as well as the most important, is fitted to secure the two great objects to which we have referred. We are persuaded, as we have already intimated, that this can be explained only by means of the principle, which appears to us to be clearly taught in Scripture, viz., that Popery, in its complex character and as a system, is Satan's great scheme for frustrating the leading objects of the Christian revelation.

Such efforts are made in the present day to diffuse defective and unduly favourable views of the Popish system, and so many influences combine to promote the success of these efforts, that we have considered it our duty to dwell chiefly on those parts of Dr. Whately's *Essays and Cautions* which may possibly be employed to aid in advancing this object. We have animadverted on them freely and plainly, but we trust that in doing so we have said nothing inconsistent with the high admiration we entertain and have expressed of his great talents, or with the profound sense we cherish of the value and importance of the services he has rendered to the world by his writings.

ART. VIII.—1. *First Report of the Commissioners for the Exposition of 1851.* London, 1852. Svo, pp. 267; with Plates.

2. *Education and Educational Institutions considered with reference to the Industrial Professions, and the Present Aspect of Society.* By the Rev. J. BOOTH, LL.D., F.R.S., Chaplain to the Marquis of Lansdowne. London, 1846. Svo, pp. 108.

3. *Papers relating to Proposals for Establishing Colleges of Arts and Manufactures for the Better Instruction of the Industrious Classes.* By T. A. LLOYD, F.R.S., F.G.S. London, 1851. Svo, pp. 40. Printed for Private Circulation.

4. *On the Importance of studying Abstract Science with a View to its Future Practical Application: Being an Introductory Lecture at Putney College.* By LYON PLAYFAIR, F.R.S., F.C.S. London, 1848. Svo. Printed for Private Circulation.

5. *Notes on the Organization of an Industrial College for Artisans.* By T. TWNING, Jun. In a letter to Lord Shaftesbury. London, 1851. Printed for Private Circulation.

6. *Suggestions for a Crystal College or New Palace of Glass for combining the Intellectual Talent of all Nations; or a Sketch of a Practical Philosophy of Education.* By W. CAVE THOMAS. London, 1851, pp. 64.

7. *How much longer are we to continue teaching nothing more than what was taught two or three Centuries ago? or ought not our highest Education to embrace the whole Range of our Present Knowledge? and ought not the Education of all Classes to have a direct Reference to the Wants of our Free, Busy, and Enlightened Age?* By the Rev. FOSTER BARHAM ZINCKE, Vicar of Wherstead. London, 1850, pp. 42.

8. *Why must we educate the Whole People? and what prevents our doing it?* By the Rev. FOSTER BARHAM ZINCKE. London, 1850, pp. 54.

9. *Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures, fondée en 1829.* Paris, pp. 42.

10. *Report of the Head Master of the Government School of Design at Sheffield on the National Exposition of Manufactures at Paris.* (In the Annual Report of the School.) Sheffield, 1849.

11. *Records of the School of Mines, and of Science applied to the Arts.* Vol. i., Part i. Inaugural and Introductory Lectures to the Courses for the Session 1851–52. Published by order of the Lord's Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. London, 1852. Svo, pp. 148.

12. *Lectures on the Results of the Great Exhibition of 1851, delivered before the Society of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, at the suggestion of H.R.H. PRINCE ALBERT, President of the Society.* London, 1852. Pp. 634.

THE Exhibition of 1851 is now an event of the past. Its gems of Nature and of Art have disappeared, and the crystal casket which inclosed them is about to return to its elements, and to assume, under another sky, a more permanent character and a nobler form. Like the hero who dies in his glory, or the sage whose name is embalmed amid the great truths which he has bequeathed to his race, the Exhibition of the World's Industry rises on the page of history when its material elements have fallen; and long after its crystal roof has ceased to dazzle, its cherished memories will put forth more hallowed and more enduring radiations. The transparent chrysalis has burst; and we must

now study the future being to which it has given birth.

Had the Exhibition of 1851 been a mere pageant to please the eye of its visitors, and to gratify the vanity of the nation ;—or had it been simply a palace of the arts to amuse and to instruct the public, it would, under either aspect, have exercised a salutary influence over our social condition, and its founder would have well deserved both individual and national gratitude. The motives, however, by which Prince Albert was influenced, and the ends which he had in view, were of a higher and nobler kind. Educated as British princes and British statesmen had never been educated—uniting with the elegant acquirements of literature and the fine arts a sound knowledge of the physical and natural sciences, and of the mechanical arts with which, in foreign lands, the sciences have been long associated, he perceived the defects in our intellectual institutions ; and occupying that high position from which truth can speak without giving offence, and reform emanate without inspiring fear, he conceived the idea of turning the attention of the nation to the state of its manufacturing arts, and giving a new direction to its science, and a fresh impulse to its industry.

During the early half of the present century, after war had ceased to usurp the talent and exhaust the resources of the State, a few individuals of ardent patriotism and enlarged views called the attention of the nation to the humble condition of its industrial and scientific arts, and to the feeble and ill-directed efforts of our scientific and educational institutions. In the pages of the two great Reviews which shed their light quarterly over the land, these truths were often pressed upon the public notice ; and this Journal has not been behind its rivals in appreciating the importance of practical science, and in advocating its claims to national recognition and support. But facts and arguments, reproof and expostulation, made no impression on the advisers of the Crown ; and the members of the Legislature were equally callous to the demands of science and of art. The seeds of truth, however, even when sparingly sown, never fail to germinate. Though buried for centuries and unproductive, they yet spring into life under the inspiration of the elements, and often cast into the social granary a rich and abundant produce.

The Metropolitan Society of Arts, which had long been the only, though the feeble patron of inventions and useful discoveries, had been stimulated into activity by the accession of a few patriotic and zealous mem-

bers. The Royal Scottish Society of Arts, established in Edinburgh, became a powerful auxiliary in the cause of practical science. The mechanical institutes, too, throughout the kingdom :—the Society for the Diffusion of Useful Knowledge—the British Association for the Advancement of Science, including Mechanics and Civil Engineering—the Amendment of the Patent Laws, which we owe to Lord Brougham—the splendid Exhibition of the Manufactures of Birmingham in a large temporary building—the Government Schools of Design—the Agricultural College at Cirencester—the College of Practical Science at Putney, under the patronage of the Duke of Buccleuch—and the Museum of Practical Geology, with its School of Mines and of Science applied to the Arts—were all important steps in the onward march of British industry. But valuable and progressive as these steps were, they were nevertheless but insulated steps in divergent directions, proceeding from no centre, and pointing to no goal. Private interests, professional prejudices, and local necessities, combined to keep the scientific institutions of the country beyond their sphere of mutual attraction ; and the voluntary character of almost all of them, and the general absence of pecuniary aid, and consequently of control, on the part of the State, prevented the establishment of some central institution round which they might cluster, and from which they might derive new life and energy.

But while these institutions were developing their powers and displaying their results, the English Government, neglecting the very interests of which it was the guardian, made no attempts even to improve and extend the national colleges and institutions over which it had control. The Scottish and even the English Universities, with a staff of able professors, whose talents might have received a fresh impulse and a better direction, were allowed to stand unchanged amid advancing civilization, while the academical institutions of other lands were embracing, with extended arms, those various courses of study which administer to the wants of social and domestic life, and promote the glory and prosperity of nations. When practical science was wanted by the British Government, it was collected by the most expensive process in committees of Parliament, often from ill-informed and interested witnesses, and consigned to blue books to which few had access, and whose contradictory hieroglyphics still fewer could understand. If there was one nation in the civilized world, for which an opposite course might have been expected, that nation was England.

Her naval pre-eminence;—her lines of steamers connecting her shores with the remotest regions of the earth;—her Saxon tongue the vehicle of liberty and truth over half the globe;—her colonies swelled, and swelling into gigantic kingdoms;—her commercial greatness, and the enormous extent of her manufacturing establishments, all concurred in demanding from England a willing patronage of the arts and sciences—a generous treatment of the men who advanced them, and a munificent endowment of the establishments which they required.

In support of these views, let us take a rapid glance at the process of industrial institutions in France. The illustrious Descartes had at an early period recommended the establishment of public lectures for artificers and workmen. He proposed that each group of trades should have a lecture-room, with its hall of tools and models, and a practical lecturer to explain the manipulations of their art to the students, and solve the difficulties which might embarrass them. At that time, even, there was a large collection of machines under the charge of the Academy of Sciences, which had been transferred to the Louvre, where it had remained for nearly a century, till the intellectual energies of a new era brought it into use. The celebrated mechanist M. Vaucanson, to whom we owe the remarkable automata of the flute player—the pipe and tabor player—and the masticating and digesting duck, had experienced the want of this species of ocular instruction, and even at an advanced age began to make a collection of machines, models, and philosophical instruments, which he placed in the Hôtel de Mortagne. At his death in 1782 he bequeathed the whole of his machines to the Government, and this valuable collection became the nucleus of the present “Conservatory of Arts and Trades.” But although a love of the marvellous more than a love of science had induced Louis XVI. to take an interest in Vaucanson’s caoutchouc automaton—of a man with the whole of his physiological apparatus, yet it does not appear that he or the nation placed a sufficient value on the extraordinary pieces of mechanism which Vaucanson had constructed. The two musical automata which we have mentioned, as might have been expected, were not acquired by the State and placed in the collection which it had received from their inventor; they were purchased by Professor Bayreuss of Helmstadt, to adorn the museum of another land, or perhaps to disappear, as they seem to have done, in the possession of their ignorant owner. The Government, however, set a proper value on the legacy of

Vaucanson. They placed it under the charge of a Comptroller-General, and issued an ordinance, requiring that all machines and models which received a national reward, should be deposited in the collection. The Hôtel de Mortagne was subsequently purchased by the Government, and an annual sum voted for the maintenance of the collection. Before the commencement of the Revolution, above 300 new machines for cotton and carding, and for the manufacture of hosiery, ribbons, and lace, were added to the museum; but amid the destruction of monuments and works of art which characterized that barbarous event, the machinery for abridging labour was peculiarly exposed to the fury of the people. The Legislative Assembly, indeed, and the National Convention appointed commissioners to collect the scattered relics of science and of art which the Vandals had spared; but it was not till 1794 that a Commission of Arts, in which the Abbé Gregoire and M. Charles were the most active, contrived to save, often at the peril of their lives, upwards of 800 objects which were lodged in the Hôtel D’Aguillen, and which led to the present establishment of the “*Conservatoire des Arts et des Metiers*,” founded by a decree drawn up by the Abbé Gregoire, and issued on the 19th Vendémiaire 1795. In 1799 the collection was transferred to the Abbey of St. Martin, where it received great additions, and was classified for the instruction of artificers and workmen. In 1806 M. de Champagny, the Minister of the Interior, founded a school for the industrial education of the children of workmen to be recommended by the mayors of towns and the prefects of departments. From 1810 to 1811 this school counted 300 students. “It furnished,” as Colonel Lloyd observes, “sub-officers to the sappers and engineers,—young men for the offices of the Bureau of Fortifications and of St. Cyr, as well as a great number of overseers of works, and superintendents of workshops and manufactories.” About this time Napoleon had offered a million of francs for prizes in the manufacture of cotton and carding machinery, and in furtherance of these views there was established in 1810 a school for instruction in the spinning of cotton and wool. Under such influences the march of industrial instruction was rapid and regular. The lectures, however, became too scientific, but this retrograde step, as soon as it was recognized, led in 1842 to the establishment of a commission under Baron Thenard, which not only remedied the evil, but raised the institution to its present improved and flourishing state. In 1846, the sum of 1,000,000 francs was voted for additions to the collection,

and in 1850 it possessed 4500 articles representing 7000 machines, together with a great number of machines themselves, chemical apparatus, philosophical instruments, and tools.

Sunday.	Charles Dupin. Olivier. Morin. Peligot. Pouillet.
Monday.	Olivier. Payen.
Tuesday.	Moll. Blanqui. Wolowski.
Wednesday.	Pouillet.
Thursday.	Ebelmen. Morin. Peligot. Moll. Blanqui. Wolowski.
Saturday.	Payen.
During the Week.	Martelet. Armengaud. De Wailly. Le Compté.

In 1850 the sum of £6250 was voted for the service of the *Conservatoire*, and the following was the system of instruction given in two theatres on different days of the week :—

Geometry applied to the Arts and Statics. Descriptive Geometry—applied and theoretical. Practical Mechanics, Steam Engine. Chemistry applied to the Arts. Physics applied to the Arts and Machines. Descriptive Geometry. Chemistry applied to the Arts. Agriculture. Industrial Economy. Industrial Legislation. Physics. Ceramic Arts and Manufactures. Mechanics. Chemistry, Metallurgy, Dyeing, Colours, &c. Agriculture, Drainage, Irrigation, and Manure. Industrial Economy. Industrial Legislation. Chemistry, Textile substances, and Economic Manufactures. Geometry. Designing of Machines. Agriculture. Industrial Design.

In the excellent institution which we have now described, industrial education was given *gratis* to mechanics, and to the poorer classes of students; and zealous and intelligent workmen thus educated were intrusted with the direction of many manufacturing establishments. The progress of the arts in England and other countries, rendered necessary a more extensive system of industrial education for the middle classes in France; and with this view the *Ecole Centrale des Arts et Manufactures* was established in 1829, under the most eminent and experienced professors, for the purpose of educating the pupils as engineers, directors of manufactories, managers of public works of all descriptions, and professors of the applied sciences. Though at first a private establishment, it was placed under the surveillance of the Minister of Public Instruction, and in 1838 under the Minister of Commerce and Agriculture, who received a public grant to defray the expense of sending up students to it from the State. In 1842 nineteen of the "Conseils Généraux," in different departments of France, voted funds to send up twenty-three young men from their towns, and the Minister had made provision for forty students whose families were entitled to the gratitude of the nation.

We have now before us the pamphlet, No. 9 of our list, containing ample and interesting details respecting the constitution of this important establishment, and as it must, to a very considerable extent, be a

pattern for all similar institutions, we shall endeavour to give an abstract of its contents. The Central School of Arts and Manufactures occupies the "Hôtel de Juigné, Rue de Thorigny, au Marais." The authority of the school is vested in a Director, and there is also a director of studies, assisted by a council of *nine* professors. Besides these professors there are other *six* who are not members of council, together with five assistant professors. In addition to these functionaries two teachers give instruction on Special Technology, (textile manufactures, carding, sawing, pottery, &c.,) other two superintend the mechanical works, and other three the department of design. There are also twelve *répétiteurs* or tutors of high character, three *préparateurs* for the experimental courses of chemistry and physics, *three* officers for the "Service d'Administration," *two* librarians, and *four* inspectors, who have the surveillance of the pupils, and are charged with the maintenance of discipline. The following are the general statutes :—

1. *The object of the School.*—The central school is destined specially to form civil engineers, directors of workshops, superintendents of manufactories,—to foster the industry of men capable of bringing into the direction of these establishments and of great public works, the lights furnished by the physical and mathematical sciences, not only when studied in their more important and general doctrines, but above all when con-

sidered in reference to their practical application.

2. *The Institution of the School.*—The council of studies chooses the professors and officers, and admits or rejects candidates according to the result of their examination. The director who lives in the college has the charge of the correspondence and the general administration, and in the interval between the monthly sittings of the council, there is a "council of order," consisting of the director and at least one professor. The Government candidates must be between the age of 18 and 21, while private students, who may be foreigners acquainted with the French language, are admitted at any age above 16. The students live in private lodging-houses, and wear no uniform; they breakfast, however, in the establishment. The fee for each student is 775 francs, (£32,) or £36, including the materials used at the school.

3. *Instruction.*—The course of instruction is limited to *three* years. It includes lectures, daily examinations, drawing and graphic exercises, chemical manipulations, working in stone and wood, physics or natural philosophy, mechanics, details in the construction of buildings and other works, problems for solution, plans for industrial constructions, and partial and general examinations. All the courses are obligatory for *three* years; but at the middle of the second year, the graphic studies, and the manipulations, and plans (projects) are divided into two series, the one of a general nature, and the other relative to the special profession for which the student is to be prepared. These specialties are *four* in number, viz., the specialty of *Mechanicians*, including, 1. The construction and establishment of machines and the mechanical arts; 2. The specialty of *Constructors*, including the erection of buildings, public works, and the physical arts,—bridges, canals, roads, railways, civil and industrial architecture, heating, lighting, and the salubrity of towns and great establishments; 3. The specialty of *Metallurgists*, including the working of mines and metallurgy; and 4thly, The specialty of *Chemists*, including *mineral* chemistry, with pottery, porcelain and glass making, chemical products in general, and the arts of assaying and refining the precious metals, organic and agricultural chemistry, dyeing, distilling, bleaching, brewing, tanning, sugar making, &c., &c.

At the end of the first six months of the second year, the student is obliged to decide to which of these special studies his future education is to be directed.

The annual course commences on the 10th

of November for the *first* year, and on the 2d of March for the *second* and *third* years, and it terminates during the month of July. The general examination takes place at the end of each course, and they all terminate from the 10th to the 20th of August, when the vacation begins.

4. *The Diplomas and Certificates of Merit.* The *diploma* of civil engineer is given only to those who have passed the prescribed trials during the three years of the school; and *certificates of capacity* are granted to those who have passed only a certain number of the prescribed trials. The trials are written and oral. The students are allowed *thirty-five* days for executing their designs in the interior of the school, and drawing the memoir in reference to them; and they are afterwards examined orally on their designs, which they are obliged publicly to explain and defend in presence of a jury of at least five professors. Those only who hold diplomas, or certificates of capacity, are recognised as having been students of the school, (*anciens élèves*), and the professors are prohibited from giving to the other pupils any kind of special certificate.

5. *Mode of Admission of the Pupils.* No pupils can be admitted without passing two examinations—one written and another oral, in arithmetic, algebra, geometry, and drawing. Preference is given to natives of France that have passed their trials, whose literary education fits them for the composition of memoirs and reports; foreign students being required only to have such a knowledge of French as will enable them to follow the lecturer.

The following is a list of the Professors who teach the different branches of knowledge in the school during the course of three years :—

FIRST YEAR.

- M. OLIVIER.—*Descriptive Geometry.*—Theory of Application; Perspective Drawing and Shadows; Stone-cutting and Carpentry.
- M. MARTELET.—1, *Analytical Geometry*, and 2, *General Mechanics.*—Theory of the Motion and Equilibrium of a Material Point; Media of a System of Material Points; Statics of Solid Bodies.
- M. WALTER DE SAINTANGE and M. FAURE.—*Construction of Machines.*—Elements of Machinery.
- M. MASSON.—*General Physics.*—Hydrostatics; Hydrodynamics; Heat, Magnetism; Radial Electricity; Electro-dynamics; and Electromagnetics; Molecular Action; Acoustics, Optics; and the Construction and Use of all kinds of Philosophical and Physical Instruments.
- M. DUMAS and M. CAHOURS.—*General Chemistry.*—Mineral and Organic.

- M. RIGOUT.—*Chemical Manipulation*.
 M. DOYERE.—*Hygeian Science and Natural History applied to Industry*.—Physiology and Medicine in reference to Public Health and the Health of Workmen; Natural History of the Animal and Vegetable Kingdom.

In the first year, Drawing and Design are taught in all their branches; and during the vacation the pupils execute plans and elevations of buildings and machines, which they are obliged to present on their return to school.

SECOND YEAR.

- M. OLIVIER.—*Descriptive Geometry*, with Modelling in Plaster for Stone Cutting.
 M. PECLÉ.—*Industrial Physics*.—Different kinds of Fuel and their heating powers; Chimneys of Factories and Houses; Furnaces; Conductibility; Vaporisation; Distillation; Evaporation; Heating and Cooling of Bodies; Heating, Ventilation, and Sanitary Arrangements for Houses.

The students of the second year construct with bricks or plaster, on a scale of one-fourth, chimneys, furnaces, &c.; and during the vacation they visit factories and workshops, of which they make drawings and write descriptions, to be presented on their return to college.

SECOND AND THIRD YEAR.

The following courses are divided into two sections, marked A and B, each of which is given every two years to the united pupils of the second and third year.

- M. BELANGER.—*Applied Mechanics*.—Section A, Statics; Section B, Hydrostatics and Hydraulics.
 M. WALTER DE SAINTANGE.—*Construction and Establishment of Machines*.—Section taught every year.—The different Elements of Machinery. Section A, Properties of Materials; Theory of their Resistance; Modes of Executing Machines and putting them together. Section B, General Principles on the Establishment and Construction of Machines.
 M. PELIGOT.—*Analytical Chemistry*.—Section A, General Method of Analysis; Gases; Acids; Alloys and Minerals. Section B, Use of Re-agents and Blowpipe, Analysis of Principal Organic Products.
 M. PAYEN.—*Industrial Chemistry*.—Section A, Minerals; and, Section B, Organic and Agricultural Chemistry.
 M. MARY.—*Architecture and Public Works*.—Section A, Public Works; Bridges; Inland and River Navigation. Section B, Architecture, Public and Private; Carpentry; Roofing; Sawing; Valuation of Works; Conducting of Water.

- M. AMEDEV BURAT.—*Geognosy and Working of Mines*.—Section A, Physical Geography; Mineralogy and Geognosy. Section B, Working, Draining, and Ventilating of Mines.
 M. FERRY.—*Metallurgy of Iron*.—Section A, Manufacture of Iron and Steel; of Zinc and Copper. Section B, High Furnaces and Foundries; Metallurgy of Tin, Lead, and Silver.
 M. FERRY.—Year A.—Ropemaking; Sawing of Wood and Stone.
 Year B.—Mill-work and Oil-making.
 M. ALCAN.—Year A.—Preparation of Textile Materials—Cotton, Wool, Lint, Hemp.
 Year B.—Weaving—Felting and Fulling.
 M. SALVETAT.*—Year B.—Manufacture of Pottery and Porcelain; Slates; Bricks and Crucibles.

SPECIAL COURSES OF THE THIRD YEAR.

- M. THOMAS.—*Steam Engine*.—Steam Navigation.
 M. PERDONNET.—*Railways*.—Locomotive Powers and Machines, &c.

The pamphlet from which we have abstracted, in an abridged form, the preceding details, contains a list, occupying *ten* pages, of all the pupils who have left the school with a diploma and a certificate of capacity, and of the situations which they now fill, or have formerly filled, together with the principal works which they have executed—the letter D being affixed to the names of those who received a diploma, and C of those who have merited only a certificate of capacity. The table is one of the most interesting documents in the statistics of education with which we are acquainted. It exhibits the true practical working of the institution from which it is derived; and were we furnished with such a table of the results of our own educational system, we should be able to appreciate better the character and value of the colleges, and schools, and private academies, from which our youth are ushered into the social world. We cannot, of course, in our limited space, give a translation of this remarkable document, but we shall attempt to give a brief analysis of it, without the hope of indicating its true value.†

* The subjects taught by these three Professors constitute *Technology*.

† The following is a specimen of the complete list:—

Fonctions Publiques. ALPHONSO (D) Director of the Conservatory of Arts and Trades at Madrid.
Industrie Diverses. CHARTRAND (C) Civil Engineer in the Isle of Cuba.

	[No. of Students.]	No. of Diplomas.	Where Employed.
AGRICULTURE,.....	<i>French, 10; Poles, 2,.....</i>	8	{ 7 in France; 1 in Turkey; 1 in Algeria; 1 in Poland; 1 in Galicia; 1 in Louisiana.
ARCHITECTURE, BUILDINGS, & CANALS,.....	<i>French, 32; Poles, 2,.....</i>	22	{ 30 in France, holding some of the highest scientific appointments in the State; 1 in Wallachia; 1 in Algeria; 1 in Germany; 1 in Switzerland.
RAILWAYS,.....	<i>French, 84; German, 2; English, 1; Poles, 4,.....</i>	70	{ 85 in France, with high appointments in Railways, Telegraphs, &c.; 1 in Wurtemberg; 1 in England; 1 in Belgium; 1 in Germany; 1 in Switzerland; 1 in United States.
INDUSTRIAL AND SCIENTIFIC INSTRUCTORS,.....	<i>French, 29; Spaniards, 2; Chilians, 1; Swiss, 1; Rio Janeiro, 1; Greeks, 1; Poles, 1,....</i>	28	{ 29 in France; 2 in Spain; 2 in Austria and Russia; 1 in Switzerland; 1 in Greece; 1 in Cracow.
SPINNING, WEAVING, CALICO PRINTING,.....	<i>French, 16; Swiss, 3; Germans, 1; Spaniards, 2; Swedes, 1,.....</i>	17	{ 20 in France; 4 Switzerland; 6 Germany; 2 Spain; 1 Sweden.
PUBLIC FUNCTIONARIES,.....	<i>French, 17; Spaniards, 2; various Foreigners, 20,.....</i>	27	{ 18 in France; 3 Brazils; 2 Spain; 16 in various parts of the Old and New World.
INDUSTRIAL CHEMISTRY, CERAMICS, GLASS WORKS, TANNERIES, SUGAR AND GAS WORKS,.....	<i>French, 37; Foreigners, 6,....</i>	28	{ 31 in France; 1 Brazils; 1 Isle of Bourbon; 1 America; 9 in Europe.
CIVIL ENGINEERS,.....	<i>French, 34; Americans, 2; Egyptians, 1; Cubans, 1; Belgians, 2; Others, 4,.....</i>	36	{ 31 in France; 4 Germany; 3 Belgium; 2 Holland; 2 Egypt; 1 Rio; 1 Spain.
MECHANICS AND MACHINES,...	<i>French, 21; United States, 2; Russian Poles, 2,.....</i>	21	{ 17 in France; 2 England; 1 America; 1 Belgium; 4 elsewhere.
METALLURGY, MINING FORGES,	<i>French and Foreigners, 69,....</i>	49	{ 40 in France; 9 Germany; 4 Belgium; 3 Algeria; 4 Prussia; 2 Spain; 1 Ireland; 6 Others.
PAPERMAKING, PLATING, COMMERCE, SALT WORKS,.....	<i>French, 20,.....</i>	16	{ 20 in France.

Besides these two great central institutions, there are in France three very large provincial Colleges of Arts and Trades, established for the education of the industrial classes. The oldest of these was founded at Chalons-sur-Mer, by the Duke de Rochefoucault. Another is placed at Angers, and a third at Aix. They are all Government establishments, maintained by an annual grant of 300,000 francs, or £12,500 for each. The scholars, 250 in number, and in three divisions, are lodged, educated, and maintained in the college during a term of three years,—five hours in the day being devoted to study, and seven to the various workshops. When their course is completed, they receive their certificates of capacity after a severe examination; and from these colleges, all the Government establishments, and many others, are supplied with engineers, or assistant engineers, highly qualified for the offices which they fill.

If we examine the preceding table, we shall find that in 1850 436 students educated at the central school, were known to hold important situations in France, and 118 in

other parts of the world. The countries adjoining France, and particularly Belgium, where the French language is spoken, have experienced the advantage of these institutions, and have derived from France their most accomplished scientific manufacturers. The Belgian Government, thus cognizant of the advantages of such a system of practical education, have resolved to establish an Industrial College at Antwerp, and probably another at Brussels, and likewise to give a more practical character to their system of primary education. In the small states of Germany, too, where classical studies predominated, almost to the exclusion of practical knowledge, a system of scientific education has been introduced, which has been attended with the happiest effects, and contributed to the rapid development of their manufacturing industry.

Such was the state of Industrial Education in France and other parts of the Continent previous to the Exhibition of 1851. We have already seen what was its condition in England. A Chair of Chemistry and of Physics in each of the Universities of the

empire, and a few insulated institutions, were the Pierian springs for refreshing the industrial genius of a nation whose manufactures were about to be rivalled under the advancing intelligence and national encouragement of foreign countries. This great truth, which had been long felt and deplored by sagacious individuals, displayed itself to the public eye, and pressed itself upon the public notice, during the year of the Exhibition. Dr. Lyon Playfair, whose position as the Commissioner appointed to aid the Juries, enabled him to form a correct and unbiassed judgment, has nobly thrown off the official reserve which that position imposed upon him, and established beyond a doubt the unpopular truth, that the Sciences have been long declining in England, while they have been rapidly advancing in every other country; and that the industrial arts of foreign lands, following the fortunes of science, have been deriving from its advancement a vitality and power which it will require all the energy of the philosopher, the manufacturer, and the Government, to equal or surpass. Dr. Playfair's lecture on the Necessity of Industrial Instruction, and of a high state of abstract science as its only sure foundation, reminds us of the eloquent and powerful appeals which, nearly a quarter of a century ago, were made by Mr. Babbage and his friends to the Government of the day.* National vanity was wounded by the truth, and second-rate gladiators rushed into the arena to challenge the writers who had thus maligned the philosophy and the philosophers of their country. It was, doubtless, mortifying to hear from the mouth of Sir John Herschell, "that whole branches of continental discovery were unstudied in England, and almost unknown by name"—that "we were fast dropping behind"—that "in mathematics we had long since drawn the rein, and given over a hopeless race"—that "in chemistry the case was not much better,"—and that "there were, indeed, few sciences which would not furnish matter for similar remark." Sir Humphrey Davy in his latter days assured us, "that there were very few persons in England who pursued science with true dignity;" and that it is by science alone that our manufacturing wealth must be preserved and extended; and Mr. Babbage emphatically declared, "that mathematics, and with it the highest departments of physical science, have gradually declined since the days of Newton."

More than a quarter of a century has

passed away since English Science was thus denounced by competent authorities: let us now see how authorities equally high, and equally disinterested, speak of its condition in the present day. Dr. Playfair assumes the unpalatable truth as an axiom. He tells us that "the means of advancing science in this country are wanting"—that "its professors and cultivators require position and patronage"—that "*Science languishes in England, and that her capital has to import it from other lands.*" The influence of such a state of things on our industry and industrial institutions is too palpable to escape the notice of Dr. Playfair. He regards the man of science—"the discoverer of abstract laws, as the real benefactor to his kind." He pronounces "abstract and not practical science to be the life and soul of industry," and its cultivators the horses of the *chariot* of industry, while "the manufacturers are but the harness by which the motion is communicated to the chariot." But he asks in continuation, "if the chariot is drawn by the horses or by the harness? Truth to say, *in this country of ours, and mark you well, in no other country in Europe, we honour the harness, but neglect the horses.* It is the harness that is gilt; the hard-working horses too often receive but meagre fare. Now, in all this I tell you a *living truth*, one far more connected with the actual material progress of our nation than you may be aware of."

But while Dr. Playfair ascribes the decline of science to the fact that the honours of the State "are chiefly conferred on those who are useful in their own time and generation," and withheld from men who discover truths eternal and sublime, and which may even have a practical application in another age; he points out other causes equally fatal to its progress in the system of education which prevails in the Universities and Academies of the empire. He considers it "truly lamentable that Oxford and Cambridge so little encourage the sciences," and he declares that the scientific instruction in the Scotch and Irish Colleges, and in University and King's College, London, "terminates just where the Industrial Colleges on the Continent begin." In the beautiful language of Eothen, quoted by Dr. Playfair, the aspirations of our youth towards science "are quenched by freezing drenches of scholastic lore." "You feel so keenly the delights of early knowledge, . . . you learn the ways of the planets, and transcend their narrow limits, and ask for the end of space; you vex the electric cylinder till it yields you for your toy to play with that subtle fire in which our earth was forged. .

* See this Journal, Vol. xiv. No. xxvii. pp. 129-158.

What more will you ever learn? Yet the dismal change is ordained; and then thin meagre Latin—(the same for everybody)—with small shreds and patches of Greek, is thrown, like a pauper's pall, over all your early lore;—instead of sweet knowledge, vile, monkish, doggerel grammars, and graduses, dictionaries, and lexicons, and horrible odds and ends of dead languages, are given you for your portion: and down you fall from Roman story to a three-inch scrap of *Scriptores Romani*, from Greek poetry down to the cold rations of *Poeta Græci*, cut up by commentators, and served out by schoolmasters." "Is this horrible quenching," adds Dr. Playfair, "of all our youthful innate love of God's truth, the education for the youth of a nation depending for its progress for their development? How is it possible that dead literature can be the parent of living science and of active industry?"

Similar views respecting the discouragement of science in England have been expressed by Mr. Glaisher of the Greenwich Observatory, in his excellent Lecture on Philosophical Instruments and Processes. "As an Englishman," he says, "anxious for the maintenance of his country's prosperity, I cannot forbear observing that lavish as is the repayment of science for its culture, inadequate, in this country, at all times, has been the repayment permitted to its followers. The lot of the scientific man has been heretofore most frequently to expend years of study, experiment, and research, his means, possibly his health: For what return? To find himself unrecognised, unheeded, and each year a poorer man than he was the year before, to find that for want of power, through the lack of means for its employment, he thus served to lay a foundation for the after use of countries more liberal and more discerning, and so to possess another with ease of the gift, to place which at the disposal of his country he has sacrificed the best years of his life. . . . The scientific man being so frequently exposed to a life of unremunerated labour, urges me to express a hope that at no distant time the pursuit of science in England may constitute a distinct profession, open to the preferments and advantages of other professions. . . . I have permitted myself to speak thus freely, from a conviction that the dawn of a brighter day for science is fast approaching. The erection of the Exhibition, and the respect shewn to mind by entrusting to its charge the management and direction of its multitudinous details, and the constituting it sole judge of the respective excellencies of its contents; the high interest that science, in its highest applications and development of

power, commanded from its illustrious designer, leads to the reasonable expectation that more encouragement will be held out to those who are capable of adding to the number of truths on which such applications are founded."

Such are the opinions entertained and avowed by competent and disinterested judges, respecting the decline of English science;—the necessity of its being endowed and honoured by the State as the only true foundation of the industrial arts;—and the probability that the Exhibition will, through the aid of Prince Albert, be the means of effecting a complete revolution in our educational, scientific, and industrial institutions. In order, therefore, to enable our readers to judge of the reasonableness of these views, and of the necessity of such essential changes to the development and progress of our manufacturing industry, we shall proceed to point out the great truths which we have learned from the Exhibition, in reference to the state of science and the industrial arts in our own and other countries;—to explain the changes which are acquired in our existing schools, academies, and universities, and to indicate the general nature and character of the new establishments for industrial instruction, and of the new institution for advancing those abstract sciences without the light of which both art and industry would perish.

In order to learn the lessons taught us by the Exhibition, we must enter into some statistical details respecting its character and results; and though some of these may have been partially given in a former Article,* while others may be regarded as more interesting from their curiosity than from their application to our argument, we have no doubt that they will be both gratifying and instructive to those who have not access to the sources of information from which we derive them.

We have already stated in a former Article, that the Exhibition building was 1848 feet long, 408 feet wide, and 108 feet high in the semicylindrical transept, 64 feet high in the nave, and 24 feet in the parts without galleries. The contract price of the building was £79,800, but owing to an increase in the extent of the building for extra offices, refreshment rooms, and the enclosure of a separate area for the machinery department, the total expense of the Crystal Palace was £107,780, 7s. 6d. Even this sum, however, owing to causes over which the contractors had no control, was not adequate to cover all expenses, and to remunerate the contrac-

* See this Journal, Vol. xv., or No. xxx., pp. 273-292.

tors for their services. An additional sum, therefore, of £35,000 was paid to them, making the total expense of the Crystal Palace, not including the fittings, to be £142,780, 7s. 6d.

The arrangements made by the Commissioners for the protection of the property of exhibitors, and of the persons of the visitors, were of the most admirable kind. The expense incurred for the external police was £5,043, 19s. 4d., and for the internal £14,603, 18s. 5d., making in all £19,647, 17s. 9d.; but as the Commissioners were desirous of "marking their sense of the admirable conduct of the police," they awarded a sum of £2710, to be distributed among them in gratuities, so that the total expense of the police amounted to £22,337, 17s. 9d. The largest number of police employed inside the building at any one time was on the 26th and 27th May, (the first shilling days,) viz.:—8 inspectors, 38 sergeants, and 609 constables on duty; the average number, however, subsequently varied from 350 to 400. In addition to police constables, 26 provincial and 36 foreign police, together with 26 interpreters, were employed. It is a curious fact that there was "almost an entire absence of crime connected with the Exhibition," and that "although the number of visits paid to it exceeded *six millions*, not more than 21 persons were apprehended in the building on any charge whatever!"

With the addition of the police expenses, the necessary outlay on the part of the Royal Commission amounts to £165,132, 5s.; and when we recollect the refusal of the Government to give any pecuniary aid, and the numerous prophecies that the Exhibition would be a failure, we cannot too highly applaud the liberality and public spirit by which the Commissioners were guided in hazarding so enormous an expenditure. If the parties liable for this large sum ever had any fear, which we believe they had not, that it would not be balanced by the receipts from the visitors of the Crystal Palace, that fear must have been removed on the very first day of its opening, when those who had been hostile to the Exhibition, as well as those who had been doubtful of its success, were compelled to admire and to applaud. The total number of visitors who entered the Palace was 6,039,195, or upwards of *six millions*.

		Average per Day.	
During 141 days,	773,766 entered with season tickets,	5,473	
" 2 "	1042 paid £1,	521	
" 29 "	245,389 paid 5s.	8,763	
" 30 "	579,519 paid 2s. 6d.,	19,319	
" 80 "	4,439,419 paid 1s.,	46,493	

It is not easy to ascertain how many visi-

tors to the Crystal Palace came from foreign countries, but it appears from the Alien lists, that the excess of foreigners who arrived in England between the 1st of April and the 30th September 1851, over those who arrived in the year 1850 during the same period, was 42,913, a number much less than had been anticipated.

The number of visitors during the week after the first four weeks (during which it varied from 58,042 to 204,060) fluctuated between 250,000 and 300,000: In the last week but one it amounted to 323,948; and in the last week the number was 518,277. On Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, October 6, 7, 8, when the admission was 1s., the numbers were, 107,815, 109,915, and 109,760. The average number of visitors each day was 42,831. The greatest number of persons in the building at one time was 93,224, on the 7th October, when the whole number during the day was 109,015. It is interesting to know that the total number of schools whose scholars visited the Exhibition was 493, and the number of scholars, 35,540. In connexion with the number of persons who visited the Exhibition, the following document, exhibiting the number who visited the public and private buildings in and near-London in the years 1850 and 1851, possesses peculiar interest:—

	1850.	1851.
Windsor Castle,	31,223,	129,400.
St. Paul's—The Floor,	No account,	{ From 600 to 6000 per hour.
" The Galleries, small fee paid,	33,313,	110,250.
Westminster Abbey,	6000 per day.	
British Museum,	720,643,	2,230,242.
National and Vernon Galleries,	Free admission.	519,745,
Hampton Court Palace,	208,374,	1,109,364.
Kew Botanic Gardens,	163,828,	325,776.
Kew Pleasure Gardens,	35,218,	184,248.
Armoury at the Tower,	33,313,	127,517.
Crown Jewels at the Tower,	Admission by regulated fees.*	233,561.
Greenwich Hospital,	32,888,	209,000.
Woolwich Arsenal,	66,054,	364,680.
Woolwich Dockyard,	17,211,	100,104.
Deptford Dockyard,	10,744,	165,421.
Dulwich Gallery,	3,313,	4,465.
Sir J. Soane's Museum,	13,000,	19,000.
United Service Museum,	3,251,	7,357.
East India Company's Museum,	33,733,	36,470.
London Missionary Museum,	18,620,	37,490.
City Museum,	No acct.,	About tenfold.
St. Stephen's Walbrook,	Not open,	2680 parties.
Temple Church and Middle Temple Hall,	450 per day.	240,000.
Northumberland House,	210,000.	
Sion House,	110,000.	
Lord Ellesmere's Gallery, Bridge-water House,	80,000.	
Lord Ward's Collection,	20,000.	

The noble conduct of the Duke of Northumberland, in opening his magnificent town-house, and also his house and splendid gardens and conservatories at Sion, was well rewarded by the excellent conduct of the

* To all the other buildings there was free admission by tickets easily procurable.

240,000 persons that had the freest access to them by ticket during the Exhibition. About 7000 were admitted in one day to Northumberland House, and "no damage whatever was done to the furniture, or to the numerous articles of vertu and china on the various tables and cabinets in the state apartments; and at Sion not a flower was taken, nor a shrub injured!" Lord Ellesmere and Lord Ward speak with equal gratification of the conduct of those who visited their fine collections.

From the great number of visitors who crowded the Crystal Palace, our readers will have anticipated the fact that a very large sum of money has been realized. The following is an analysis of the receipts and the expenditure up to the 29th February 1852:—

RECEIPTS.		
Subscriptions,	£67,896	12 9
Catalogue Contract,	3,200	0 0
Refreshment Contract,	5,500	0 0
Season Tickets,	67,514	1 0
Receipts at the doors,	356,278	3 7
Receipts from Retiring Rooms,	4,580	3 8
Interest and Premium on Exchequer Bills,	897	17 4
Miscellaneous Receipts,	233	8 7
	<u>£506,100</u>	<u>6 11</u>
PAYMENTS.		
Personal Services,	£67,309	11 7
Extra Clerks from Law Stationers,	735	4 10
Metropolitan Police,	22,357	17 9
Travelling Expenses & Expenses of Committee,	1,220	12 4
General Office Expenses,	8,869	1 11
Building and Fittings,	169,998	15 2
General Maintenance of Exhibition,	4,877	19 7
Jury Department,	6,916	10 8
Law Expenses, Stamps, &c.,	2,106	7 1
Award to Messrs. Mundays,	5,707	1 4
Interest on do., and other Interests, Contingencies,* &c.,	2,695	9 0
Total Expenditure,	<u>£292,794</u>	<u>11 3</u>
Total Receipts,	506,100	6 11
Exhibition Fund in the hands of the Committee,	<u>£213,305</u>	<u>15 8</u>

The First Report of the Commissioners, from which we have abstracted these interesting details, contains a great number of curious facts, which, had we space, we would willingly transfer to our pages. The average expenditure of each class of visitors on refreshments (the receipts for which were £74,349 15s. 3d.) was—

Visitors at 5s. and upwards, 4s. 4d. per head.	
" 2s. 6d. " 4s. 8d.	
" 1s. " 2s. 4d., the general average being about 3s.	

The following was the average amount expended by each visitor, including his entrance fee, catalogues, refreshments, and waiting rooms:—

Entrance fee, £1 0 0	£1 0 7.83
" " 0 5 0	0 5 5.75
" " 0 2 6	0 3 0.09
" " 0 1 0	0 1 3.03

* Among the expenses incurred we find a loss on light gold, £218; on defaced and foreign coin, £232; on spurious coin, £90; and on lost coats and umbrellas, £7 3s. 6d.

The most interesting portion of the Commissioners' First Report relates to the contents of the Exhibition, the value of the articles exhibited, the number of persons that exhibited them, and the rewards conferred by the Juries. The following table shews the nature and value of the different articles contributed by the United Kingdom:—

BY THE UNITED KINGDOM.		
<i>Group A—Raw Materials.—</i>		
Class I. Mining and Mineral Products,	£21,623	12 10
II. Chemical and Pharmaceutical do.,	3,279	16 4
III. Substances for Food,	3,565	4 3
IV. Vegetable and Animal Substances, for the Arts,	3,974	15 10
<i>Group B—Machinery.—</i>		
V. Machines for direct Use, Carriages, &c.,	108,115	6 11
VI. Manufacturing Machines and Tools,	44,976	6 10
VII. Civil Engineering and Architectural Articles,	20,123	18 11
VIII. Naval Architecture and Military Engineering,	30,079	4 5
IX. Agricultural and Horticultural Machines and Implements,	13,426	8 8
X. Philosophical, Musical, Horological, and Surgical Instruments,	63,976	12 7
<i>Group C—Textile Fabrics.—</i>		
XI. Cotton Manufactures,	1,828	9 9
XV. & XII. Woollen and Mixed Fabrics,	24,433	5 0
XIII. Silk and Velvet,	5,427	15 10
XIV. Manufactures from Flax and Hemp,	5,000	9 0
XVI. Leather, Saddlery, Harness, Skins, Furs,	9,764	6 6
XVII. Paper, Stationery, Printing, and Bookbinding,	7,242	0 2
XVIII. Specimens of Printing and Dyeing,	4,239	8 2
XIX. Tapestry, Carpets, Lace, Embroidery,	24,128	14 1
XX. Clothing for personal use,	6,408	11 2
<i>Group D—Metallic, Vitreous, and Ceramic Manufactures.—</i>		
XXI. Cutlery and Edge Tools,	1,287	0 10
XXII. Iron and General Hardware,	57,669	11 3
XXIII. Precious Metals, Jewellery, Articles of Vertu,	340,481	17 7
XXIV. Glass,	21,126	1 11
XXV. Pottery—China, Porcelain,	10,939	7 3
<i>Group E—Miscellaneous Manufactures.—</i>		
XXVI. Furniture, articles in Papier Maché; Japan,	45,925	7 11
XXVII. Mineral Manufactures, Marbles, Porphyries, &c.,	8,628	2 1
XXVIII. Animal and Vegetable manufactures,	4,251	18 7
XXIX. Miscellaneous and Small Wares,	15,364	8 10
<i>Group F—Fine Arts.—</i>		
XXX. Sculpture, Models and Plastic Art,	55,413	8 6
<i>Belonging to Different Classes.</i>		
Transept,	12,589	0 0
Main Avenue,	40,113	0 0
Outside,	3,425	13 9
Articles exhibited by her Majesty and Prince Albert	12,778	0 0
Koh-i-noor Diamond, not valued.		
TOTAL of the United Kingdom,	<u>£1,031,607</u>	<u>4 9</u>
BY THE COLONIES.		
From India,	£70,000	0 0
" Canada,	2,378	17 7
" Van Diemen's Land,	1,500	0 0
" Jersey and Guernsey,	1,456	5 2
" Nova Scotia,	1,350	0 0
" Malta,	1,133	8 10
" Cape of Good Hope,	367	17 10
" Western Africa,	323	0 0
" British Guiana,	150	0 9
" New South Wales,	132	15 0
" Bahama Islands,	122	19 0
" Ionian Islands,	118	4 0
" Trinidad,	100	0 0
" Ceylon,	95	0 0
" Mauritius,	84	10 0
" New Zealand,	80	0 0
Carry forward,	<u>£79,662</u>	<u>2 6</u>

	Brought forward, £79,662 2 6
From Barbadoes,	63 0 0
" Other fourteen localities,	176 12 6
TOTAL from the Colonies,	£79,901 15 0

BY FOREIGN STATES.

From France,	294,683 11 1
" Austria,	71,44 18 2
" Belgium,	60,000 0 0
" Russia,	58,889 14 5
" Prussia,	41,314 15 0
" United States,	23,835 0 0
" Bavaria and other six Zollverein States,	19,299 15 0
" Rome,	17,475 0 0
" Spain,	10,000 0 0
" Tuscany,	10,000 0 0
" Turkey,	9,500 0 0
" Tunis,	8,988 8 0
" Switzerland,	8,153 17 11
" China,	6,367 10 0
" Netherlands,	5,920 10 0
" Sardinia,	5,500 0 0
" Portugal and Madeira,	5,000 0 0
" Hanse Towns and North Germany,	4,457 10 0
" Sweden and Norway,	3,941 17 0
" Denmark,	2,000 0 0
" Chili,	1,000 0 0
" Egypt, Greece, Persia, Mexico, New Granada, Brazil, Society Isles, St. Domingo,	2,649 0 0

TOTAL from Foreign Countries, £670,420 11 7

SUMMARY.	
United Kingdom,	£1,031,607 4 2
British Colonies,	79,901 15 0
Foreign Countries,	670,420 11 7
Total value of articles exhibited,	£1,781,929 11 4
To which if we add the Koh-i-noor,	250,000 11 4
We have,	£2,031,930 2 8

The Commissioners, including all the expense of the building, have stated that the value of the Crystal Palace and its contents was fully Two MILLIONS. Adding the Koh-i-noor at a low value, which ought to have been done, the value of the whole amounts to Two AND A QUARTER MILLION.

From the articles exhibited, we must now pass to the exhibitors, and the rewards which they have received. The Commissioners have published a very curious table, occupying eight pages, shewing the number of exhibitors from each country to each of the thirty classes of articles, with the quantity of space, horizontal and vertical, which their articles occupied; but it is only the following general results which we can give:—

	No. of Exhibitors.	Space in Superficial Feet.	
		Horizontal.	Vertical.
United Kingdom,	6861	189,275	411,340
British Colonies,	520	17,784	18,974
Foreign Countries,	6556	131,655	222,832
Total,	13,937	388,714	653,143

On the same scale the Commissioners have published a list of the awards, given to exhibitors of every nation, and in every class. The following is the general result:—

	No. of Exhibitors.	Council Medals.	Prize Medals.	Honourable Mention.	Total Awards.
Group A.	2474	22	552	675	1249
B.	3022	88	516	163	767
C.	3818	4	923	544	1471
D.	1705	32	510	407	949
E.	1801	14	371	249	634
F.	930	4	82	85	171
Total,	13,750	164	2954	2123	5241
Unclassified,	187	7	"	"	"
Total,	13,937	171	2954	2123	5241

After the Exhibition was closed, the medals were sent to the Commissioners from different foreign states, and we presume have been given to the exhibitors with some solemnity and form at public meetings held for the purpose. In France, where all such duties are performed so as to confer honour upon the promoters of science and industry, the medals were distributed by the President Louis Napoleon, and the decoration of the Legion of Honour conferred upon the most distinguished exhibitors. Within the last month, on the 27th June, the medals awarded to the Tuscan exhibitors, *thirty-two* in number, with 25 honourable mentions, were distributed at Florence in the Hall Dell' Buonomore, by M. Baldasseroni, minister of finance, commerce, and public works,

having on his right hand the minister of Great Britain, Sir Henry Bulwer.* The Grand Duke had desired that the distribution of these honourable awards to the genius and talent of his subjects, should be conducted in as solemn a manner as possible, *in order to create a new tie between the throne and industry.* In order still more to evince the value which he attached to the prosecution of the scientific and industrial arts, the Grand Duke has instituted an industrial decoration, consisting of medals of the first and second class, bearing on one side the head of himself, as the founder of the order, and on the other the words ALL' INDUSTRIA—*To Industry.*

Such is a general view of the Exhibition, and its immediate results. Time alone can shew us the happy influence which it has exercised upon individuals and nations, not merely in promoting feelings of mutual kindness and sympathy among races hitherto hostile or estranged, but in advancing throughout the civilized world, and in introducing among barbarous communities, those peaceful arts which alone can ensure the social and physical happiness of man.

The Prince to whose talents and moral courage we owe the Exhibition itself, was not likely to leave it to work out its results within the United Kingdom. It might have been expected indeed that the statesmen who contend for place, and desire reputation, would have seen in the advancement of abstract and industrial science the true elements of political power, and the pure sources of undying fame, as well as the highest objects of political duty; but excepting in one document, we have not observed even the remotest allusion to art, industry, and science, in the manifestoes of parties, or in the appeals of individual aspirants to power. The document to which we refer is the Royal speech at the prorogation of Parliament, in which Her Majesty pledges herself "to extend and improve the national education, *to develop and encourage industry, art, and science,* to elevate the moral and social condition, and thereby promote the welfare and happiness of the people." This is the first time that the word *Science* has, in the hearing of Parliament, been pronounced from the throne of England, and we trust it is an earnest that the Minister intends to co-operate with Her Majesty and the Prince in fulfilling the expectations which a sentiment so new and noble cannot fail to have roused.

The first step to embalm the memory and perpetuate the results of the Exhibition, was

to obtain and preserve descriptions with diagrams and representations, either pictorial or photographic, of its varied contents; but it was soon found that this was a very imperfect plan, and that it would be advisable, with the co-operation of the exhibitors, to collect actual specimens of the materials and fabrics themselves, and, when possible, the very instruments and models which were exhibited. In this way the collection would be a valuable means of reference for commercial, scientific, and artistic purposes, and would enable a strictly philosophical classification of them to be made. The success of this plan has already far exceeded the expectations of the Commissioners; and in so liberal a spirit has the proposal been received by exhibitors, both native and foreign, that a foundation has already been laid for a "Trade Collection with the Imports and Exports of the World," where men of business may examine and practically test samples of the very articles in which they are trading. No fewer than 1020 British exhibitors have presented specimens of the articles exhibited, while 654 have presented drawings, and 685 have promised samples, &c. Of the colonial exhibitors 212 have presented specimens, while 803 foreign exhibitors have done the same. The collection, therefore, which has been temporarily deposited by permission of the Queen in Kensington Palace, has been roughly valued as follows:—

British,	£6563
Colonial,	452
Foreign,	1703
		<hr/>
		£8718

Our readers will now be prepared, by the preceding details, to see the necessity and appreciate the advantages of establishing in the metropolis a Great Industrial Institution, similar in character, though more comprehensive in its plan, to the "Central School of Arts and Manufactures" in Paris,—a University, in short, in which the sciences and the arts of industry will be taught and illustrated by a Museum containing all the raw materials employed in manufactures, and all the machines and instruments by which these materials are modified and combined. Such a plan would no doubt startle those ill-informed and presumptuous individuals who regard the arts and manufactures of England as having long ago reached the acme of perfection, and who consider the voluntary institutions already in existence as amply sufficient to keep them at the high level which they have already attained. To demand new establishments for the useful arts appears to such persons an acknowledgment

* See the *Times* of July 7th, 1852.

of our inferiority to other nations; and to sustain them by national liberality is pronounced to be *un-English*, and inconsistent with the voluntary liberality of the people and the free action of our institutions. Does not the Exhibition, say they, prove the high condition of English art and the advanced state of her industry? What nation has surpassed us in machinery and tools? and in what part of the globe can we find superiors in the splendid fabrics with which British industry has adorned the Exhibition? But even if our arts and manufactures are entitled to so high a distinction, may it not be possible to raise them still higher? May not foreign nations, with a better climate and cheaper labour, and more intellectual Governments, be rapidly gaining upon us in the race? and do they not already surpass us in many important departments both in the fine and the useful arts?

Dr. Playfair, in his admirable lecture on the results of the Exhibition, has had the moral courage to answer these questions in their broadest aspect, and to declare truths to which the presumptuous ear of England has been but little accustomed.

"All European nations, except England," says he, "have recognised the fact that *industry must in future be supported not by a competition of local advantages, but by a competition of intellect*. Their thinking men have proclaimed it; their Governments have adopted it as a principle of state, and every town has now its schools in which are taught the scientific principles involved in manufactures; while each metropolis rejoices in an Industrial University, teaching how to use the alphabet of science in reading manufactures aright. Were there any effects observed in the Exhibition from this intellectual training of their industrial populations? The official reserve necessarily imposed upon me as the Commissioner appointed to aid the Queen need exist no longer, and from my personal conviction I answer, without qualification, in the affirmative. The result of the exhibition was one that England may well be startled at. Wherever—and that implies almost every manufacture—science or art was involved as an element of progress, we saw, as an inevitable law, that the nation which most cultivated them was in the ascendant. Our manufacturers were justly astonished at seeing most of the foreign countries rapidly approaching and sometimes excelling us in manufactures our own by hereditary and traditional right. Though certainly very superior in our own common *cultery*, we could not claim decided superiority in that applied to *surgical instruments*, and were beaten in some kinds of *edge tools*. Neither our *swords* nor our *guns* were left with an unquestioned victory. In our *plate glass*, my own opinion—and I am sure that of many others—is, that if we were not beaten by Belgium, we certainly were by France. In *flint glass*, our ancient *prestige* was left very doubtful; and the only

important discoveries in this manufacture were not those shown on the English side. Belgium, which has deprived us of much of our American trade in *woollen manufactures*, found herself approached by competitors hitherto almost unknown, for Russia had risen to eminence in this branch, and the German woollens did not shame their birthplace. In *silversmith work* we had introduced a large number of foreign workmen as modellers and designers;* but, nevertheless, we met with worthy competitors. In *calico printing* and *paper staining*, our designs looked wonderfully French; whilst ours, though generally as brilliant in themselves, did not appear to nearly so much advantage. In *earthenware* we were masters, as of old; but in *china* and in *porcelain* our general excellence was stoutly denied, although individual excellencies were very apparent. In *hardware* we maintained our superiority, but were manifestly surprised at the rapid advances made by other nations."—*Lecture* on pp. 89, 90; or, in the volume of *Lectures*, pp. 193-195.

With these facts and opinions before us, we cannot but conclude, as Dr. Playfair does, that many foreign nations, and even those who were obviously in our rear, have been advancing in the race of industry *at a greater rate than ours*;—and if this be true we *must be left behind*. But this palpable truth, which Dr. Playfair seems almost unwilling directly to declare, he subsequently brings out in a form as startling as it is pregnant with instruction and warning:—

"All the visitors," he says, "both foreign and British, were agreed upon one point,—that whichever might be the first of the exhibiting nations—regarding which there were many opinions—that certainly our great rival France was *second*. Let us hope that in this there is no historical parallel. After the battle of Salamis, the generals, though claiming for each other the first consideration as to generalship, unanimously admitted that Themistocles deserved the second; and the world ever since, as Smith remarks, has accepted this as a proof that Themistocles was *beyond all question the first general*."—*Ib.*, pp. 90, 195.

Although Dr. Playfair, as an Englishman, expresses the hope that there is no historical parallel between the Exhibiting Nations and the Athenian generals, he must doubtless admit, as a logician, that *the world* will accept his statement, and the opinion of "all the visitors, foreign and British," as a *proof*

* It is a curious fact, that our Manchester calico printers give liberal salaries to foreign designers in France. In our glass works, too, foreign science has been purchased to assist in their management. In the potteries we have foreign managers and designers; and our diamond-setters, as well as our silversmiths, depend much on foreign talent in art, and foreign skill in execution. Dr. Playfair calls this a *suicidal policy which must have a termination*.

that France was the first exhibiting nation in the Crystal Palace."

But whatever be the opinion which we form of the relative progress of exhibiting nations, we are now all agreed on the great point, that the time has arrived when science must be united with skill in the advancement of the Industrial Arts, and that this union can be effected only by a grand effort, individual and national, to establish upon a permanent basis a metropolitan university of arts and manufactures. This scheme has been pressed on the attention of the Royal Commission by memorials from many influential bodies. The magistrates and manufacturers of Birmingham and Bristol, who contributed so largely to the funds as well as to the contents of the Exhibition, have in an able memorial pointed out the necessity of an Industrial University. "Having long felt the necessity of some more extended system of practical and scientific education in England, which would place within the reach of the industrial classes a much higher standard of scientific attainments," than they could otherwise reach, they express their conviction "that with greater facilities in elementary scientific education, intimately connected with and always accompanied by practical illustrations and manipulations, there would be found as much original genius and talent to develop in the people of this country as in those of the great continental states of Europe." They had seen in Paris the great Industrial Institutions with their efficient and interesting museums under the charge of the State, where numerous young men "the most eminent of the age," had received the systematic education which had raised them to rank, consideration and fortune, and they longed for similar institutions in their own country. They admitted, with gratitude, that Government had made a great step by the establishment of schools of design, and the Museum of Practical Geology, though "the first were only partial in their advantages, and the latter only an *isolated branch* limited in its influence." They therefore solicit the Commissioners "that a great central college of arts and manufactures should be established in London, and endowed with the whole surplus receipts of the Exhibition;" "that a museum of arts and manufactures should be established at the college, the basis of which might be selected from the present Exhibition; that provincial schools, having the same object in view, should be connected with the great central college, and carried on under the same system, and that the public should have a voice in a general system of education of such

vital importance to their own commercial prosperity."

Views similar to those of large municipal bodies had presented themselves to several individuals, and there can be no doubt that the Prince himself, and his distinguished colleagues in the Commission, had at a very early period contemplated the establishment of a national system of Industrial teaching. Mr. F. Twining, junior, had, as early as 1849, communicated to Mr. Scott Russell the idea of such an institution, analogous to the *Gewerbe Institut* at Berlin, and in a letter to the Earl of Shaftesbury in August, 1851, he proposes an Industrial College as the means of improving the efficiency of British artisans. His scheme embraces five points, —1. The establishment by Royal Charter of a Central College on a large scale, in or near the Metropolis, and *sufficiently endowed* to secure its permanent efficiency; 2. The establishment of evening schools in all large towns, for the professional instruction of apprentices, and connected with the central institute; 3. That qualified journeymen shall be admitted as inmates of the college; 4. That diplomas and certificates of merit shall be given after due examination; and 5thly, That a Museum of Industry shall be established containing specimens, models, or diagrams, illustrating the latest improvements and inventions.

The important subject of a great Central Institution of Arts and Manufactures has been viewed in all its various phases and relations by Prince Albert and the Royal Commissioners, and they have resolved to devote to its establishment the Exhibition Fund amounting to upwards of £150,000. The specific plan that has been adopted by the Commission will be made public in their Second Report, which will very speedily be published: but whatever the details of the plan may be, we may rest assured, from what we know of the capacity of the Prince and of the wisdom and talents of his coadjutors, that it will as far transcend the ideas that have yet been made public, as the Exhibition itself transcended the highest expectations of its friends. The Institution will of course consist of a College or University, with laboratories and workshops, a museum and a library. An ample staff of professors carefully selected, and uniting practical with theoretical science, will deliver regular courses of lectures,—a number of tutors analogous to the *Répétiteurs* of the *Ecole Centrale* will assist the pupils in their preparations both for the class and public examinations; while well informed and skilful workmen will superintend the chemical and other manipulations in the laboratory, and the mechanical

and handicraft operations in the workshops. In addition to these teachers, we would strongly recommend the addition of Honorary or Emeritus professors—men of high name and lofty acquirements, who would occasionally give one or more lectures to the assembled students. The association of such men would give dignity to the Institution, inspire the youth with the desire to emulate them, and form a link between the artists and manufacturers and the upper classes of society, with whom our most distinguished men are in the habit of associating.

The Museum will, of course, consist of three parts—of the collection of raw materials and fabrics, the subjects of export and import throughout the world,—a collection of tools, scientific apparatus, instruments, and models,—and a department of actually working machines. This museum, which is peculiarly a desideratum in England, will answer another great purpose beside that of instruction. When the public attention is turned to the value of practical science, and to the importance of encouraging every new idea, and every species of invention, and above all, when they have learned that there cannot be a *frivolous* patent, the present patent laws* cannot fail to be repealed, and an inalienable privilege given to the patentee on the report of a Board of Commissioners. For the use of such a Board, the hall of models and the collection of apparatus and instruments will be of essential use, by ena-

bling them to decide on the novelty of inventions submitted to their judgment.

The establishment of affiliated Schools of Industry in the provinces will follow in the train of the great Central Institution. At these primary Industrial Schools the youth will be prepared for their higher studies in the metropolis; and we have no doubt that our private academies, our parochial and other schools, and even our universities and colleges, will tell the Rev. Mr. Zincke that they will no longer “continue to teach only what was taught two or three centuries ago;” and that they will accommodate their system of instruction to that “high education which embraces the whole range of our present knowledge, and has a direct reference to the wants of a free, busy and enlightened age.”

Extensive as this plan necessarily is, it is contemplated by the Prince and the Commissioners to offer sites, in the locality which they have acquired, to all the institutions in the metropolis connected with science and the arts. The National Gallery will here find a valuable and appropriate resting-place, and the various Societies* which, we believe, are required, on account of the want of Government offices, to quit their apartments in Somerset House, will be desirous of having new and more commodious halls erected for them by the State in the same locality. Other institutions, such as the School of Mines, (the Museum of Practical Geology,) the Linnæan, the Geographical, the Chemical, the Microscopic, and the Meteorological Societies, will seek an asylum in the same sacred grove; and while all these institutions will maintain their former independence, and be regulated by their own laws, their libraries and their collections might, as a measure of economy, as well as of utility, be united under the same apartments and managed by the same officers.

We now approach a question of vast importance, which we have no doubt has been anxiously considered by Prince Albert and the Commissioners: Is the great institution, of which we have been writing, to be a self-supporting one? or is it to be national, and endowed by the Government? Mr. Twining never doubts “that it must be founded under Royal Charter, and sufficiently endowed to secure its permanent efficiency.” All the Industrial Institutions on the Continent flourish under state endowment; and if the locality is purchased and the buildings erected by the Exhibition Funds, the Gov-

* The Patent Amendment Law, just passed, is certainly a great improvement upon the former law; but a tax of such magnitude as it still imposes on inventors is a disgrace to the statute-book. Its provisions are as follow: One patent only is necessary for the United Kingdom and the Colonies,—protection for six months is given for a fee of £5; at the end of six months a fee of £6 is paid for the notice to proceed with the patent; the other fees are, £5 for sealing, and £5 for filing the specification; at the expiry of the third year, £10 is to be paid—and at the expiry of the seventh year, £80: The stamp-duties are, £5 for warrant of law officer, £10 for certificate that the fee of £40 is paid, and £20 for certificate that the fee of £80 is paid:—These fees amount in all to £176!! So that, if Mr. Watt presented to the public his steam engine, or Messrs. Cooke and Wheatstone their electric telegraphs, they must each pay £176, without any security that their inventions will be protected from piracy. A Protectionist Government would not be worth an hour's purchase were it to inflict a fine of £176 upon a tenant-farmer who discovered a cheap and efficient manure, or upon an agricultural mechanist who invented the most perfect reaping-machine. It is a problem of the indeterminate kind, why England exacts £176 for a privilege which other nations, less dependent on inventions, confer for the *tenth* part of the sum; and it is one, in our judgment, absolutely incapable of solution, why the wealthiest country in the world, and the most dependent on art and science, should demand a price for a right which ought to be given for nothing, or paid for as a boon to the nation.

* The Royal Society, the Society of Antiquaries, the Geological and the Astronomical Societies.

ernment cannot refuse to supply the annual expenditure and maintenance of the college by a handsome endowment. Experience will not permit us to place in the hands of Government the right of appointing the professors and the other necessary functionaries. A general superintendence, confined to the right of inquiry in the case of maladministration, is all the power that can be safely intrusted to political patrons.

The Prince and the Commissioners have no doubt adopted some decided views relative to the nature and character of the studies which are to be pursued within the College. Generally speaking, there will be little difference of opinion on that subject; but there is one phase of it upon which a variety of opinions will be entertained, and which, therefore, requires to be viewed in all its bearings. What is the relation between abstract Science and Art? What are the influences which they mutually exert upon each other? And to what extent is abstract science, independent of its applications, to be introduced into the curriculum of study, or demanded from students who may have received their scientific education in other institutions? These are questions of fundamental importance. Dr. Whewell* has made some reference to the first in his admirable Lecture on the General Bearing of the Exhibition; and Dr. Playfair,† in his most appropriate and eloquent discourse "On the Study of Abstract Science, as essential to the Progress of Industry," has indicated very clearly the answer he would give to all our questions. It is well known, however, that practical men, not defective in judgment, and especially civil-engineers, have spoken and written rather contemptuously of the value of abstract science in the professions depending on chemical, mathematical, and mechanical knowledge. It is oftener thought than said, "that an ounce of practice is worth a ton of theory;" but without denying that there may be theories of which this equation is true, we venture to say that we could name many examples in which an ounce of theory has produced many tons of practice. Dr. Whewell has made some observations, which without any design on his part may be regarded as giving a kind of predominance to art over science. Regarding science as the "natural and general succession to art," as "criticism is to poetry," he pronounces *art to be "the mother of science—the vigorous and comely mother of a daughter of far loftier and serener beauty;"*

or as he elsewhere expresses it, "Men were led to seek for science as well as art; for science is the natural complement of art, and fulfilment of the thoughts and hopes which art excites; for *science is the fully-developed blossom of which art is the wonderfully-involved bud.*" It is true, as Dr. Whewell remarks in support of this opinion, that there were good artificers in brass and iron before the principles of the chemistry of metals were known;—but these principles were not deduced from the works of Tubal-Cain, or Benvenuto Cellini, or any of their successors. It is true also that wine cheered the heart of man before he knew the philosophy of vinous fermentation;—but that philosophy never sprung from the fermented juice of the grape. It is true, too, that pyramids, and obelisks, and cyclopæan walls, and pillars and entablatures of gigantic Doric, long preceded "a theory of mechanical powers;"—but the pulley, the wedge, and the lever, were not derived from the art which raised these mighty masses from the ground; and at this moment we do not even know by what power they were lifted into the air. We are not acquainted, indeed, with a single case where science sprung from art. The harp and organ of Jubal never taught us the principles of Acoustics, nor have we learned from the gopher ark of Noah the Strength of materials and the doctrines of Carpentry. Even the magnificent Temple of Solomon, with its costly stones, its pillars of brass, and its vessels of silver and of gold, has not shed a ray of light upon the humblest of the sciences. Necessity, as the proverb tells us, was the mother of invention; but science never had a mother. She sprang, like Minerva, from the brain of Jove, not full grown, but with the elements of growth;—not an organic body, but a germ to be organized;—not a tree rejoicing in its foliage, but a seed to become the parent of luxuriant forests, destined to give shelter and food to man, and elaborate its leaves for the healing of the nations.

But while science has been thus independent in her march, art has, in a direction converging with hers, ever been vigilant and energetic in the cause of humanity. Before science, her younger sister, was born, she had given shelter, and food and raiment to man;—she had provided luxuries for his board, and medicines for his cure, and arms for his defence;—she had entrenched him in the cloud-capt tower, and lodged him in the gorgeous palace; and she had, for his use, turned the Oxus from its course, and swelled the Jaxartes with the waters of its sister stream. She has travelled over continents on the chariot's iron wing, and she has

* Lectures on the Results of the Exhibition, Lect. i., pp. 3-34.

† Records of the School of Mines, pp. 23-48.

marched over the mountain waves in her arks of wood and of iron; and acting in co-operation with her younger sister, she holds out to us the prospect of fresh achievements over sublunary matter and terrestrial space.

In contemplating science and art in their separate spheres, there is in each a most essential feature, which, though it may not affect the family likeness, gives to the one a loftier mien and a diviner form;—it is the celestial halo which encircles the Madonna of Science. Earth-born, and chained to the earth, Art, in her highest aspirations, whether useful, or ornamental, or imaginative, works with terrestrial materials, and contemplates but terrestrial forms. The mechanist has not found the place (the *πρυτανία*) from which he can move the earth with his lever, nor has he been able to span the shortest space in our system. His presumptuous hopes were buried under the ruins of his Babel Tower. The engineer has not thought of navigating the ethereal ocean of universal space, and he has not even solicited the aid of a Company to navigate the atmosphere in which he lives and breathes. The practical chemist has not essayed the air and the earth of our neighbour planets, nor analyzed the glorious emanations which telegraph throughout universal space the eternal truth, that God is Light, and that in Him there is no darkness at all.

Hence it is that Art preceded Science without giving her birth. When man received the earth as his freehold, he was surrounded with natural objects from which he had to supply his more immediate necessities; but no sooner were his physical wants supplied, than his intellectual powers came into play, and physical truths and physical laws were the result of his labour. Science now threw her auroral beams upon the mountain range of art, and in her meridian path developed the principles and laws of material nature. It was science alone that rounded the earth on which we dwell—that turned the gigantic sphere round its axis, to be lighted and heated by the God of Day—that placed the sun on the throne of our system, and separated that system from the universe of stars. It was the lamp of science that conducted the geologist into the dark caverns of the earth, to disinter its dead, to excavate its riches, and to read to man the mortifying lesson, that he is as much an upstart in her chronology as he is an atom among her everlasting hills. It was science that converted the microscope from its drop of water and its lens of glass into that noble instrument which is every hour disclosing the otherwise unseen crea-

tions of unparalleled wisdom; and it is science that has swollen the spy-glass of Galileo into the colossal tube with which Lord Rosse is contemplating the infinitely distant and infinitely great.

But while science has thus transcended art in expounding mysteries which the latter never pretended to approach, she has outstripped her handmaid in theories which art might have been expected to reduce to practice. The chemical philosopher has determined the elements of the diamond; but the artist has not electrified them into the brilliant gem. The mathematician has discovered the true form of a perfect lens; but the optician has not succeeded in giving the hyperbolic form to his materials. The natural philosopher has shown how to make telescopes perfectly achromatic; but the artist in glass cannot furnish the materials necessary to construct them. The natural philosopher has taught us the use of electricity as a moving power, and as a source of heat and light; but art has not yet taught us to apply it in moving our ships, or in heating our dwellings, or in lighting our streets.

In thus pointing out to those who are not deeply versed in the principles and history of science, the relations between art and science, our object is to prepare the reader for the great truth advocated by Dr. Playfair, "that the study of abstract science is essential to the progress of industry." By means of numerous and instructive examples, in which the most abstract chemical and physical truths have resulted in the most valuable practical applications, in the establishment of new arts and new manufactures, he has shewn to the "practical men," and to the ignorantly learned, if the prejudices of the one and the incapacity of the other will allow them to see it, that "practice and science must now join together in a solemn union," and "that the time is past when practice can go on in the blind and vain confidence of a shallow empiricism, severed from science like a tree from its roots." "It is indispensable," he adds, "for this country to have a scientific education in connexion with manufactures, if we wish to outstrip the intellectual competition which now, happily for the world, prevails in all departments of industry. As surely as darkness follows the setting of the sun, so surely will England recede as a manufacturing nation, unless her industrial population become much more conversant with science than they now are."

That these views are not peculiar to ourselves, or to the distinguished chemist whom we have quoted, might be shewn by nume-

rous references to the various lectures on the subject of the Exhibition, and to the reports of the different juries which will soon be published. In advocating the same truth, a foreigner peculiarly acquainted with the relations between abstract and practical science, and with the working of the educational institutions on the Continent, the illustrious Liebig, has told the world, and England in particular, with whose wants he is well acquainted, "that the great desideratum of the present age is practically manifested in the establishment of schools in which the national sciences occupy the most prominent place in the course of instruction. From these schools a more vigorous generation will come forth, powerful in understanding, qualified to appreciate and to accomplish all that is truly great, and to bring forth fruits of universal usefulness. Through them the resources, the wealth, and the strength of empires will be incalculably increased." In a similar strain has the illustrious Humboldt, the prince and patriarch of philosophers, pled the cause of abstract science as the fountain of national wealth, and the source of national greatness and security.

"An equal appreciation," he says, "of all parts of knowledge, is an especial requirement of the present epoch, in which the material wealth and the increasing prosperity of nations are in a great measure based on a more enlightened employment of natural products and forces. The most superficial glance at the present condition of European States shews, that those which linger in the race cannot hope to escape the partial diminution and perhaps the final annihilation of their resources. It is with nations as with nature, which, according to a happy expression of Goethe, knows no pause in ever-increasing movement, development, and production—a curse still cleaving to standing still.

"Nothing but serious occupation with chemistry and natural and physical science can defend a State from the consequences of competition. Man can produce no effect upon nature, or appropriate her powers, unless he is conversant with her laws, and with their relations to material objects according to measure and numbers. And in this lies the power of popular intelligence, which rises or falls as it encourages or neglects this study. Science and information are the joy and justification of mankind. They form the springs of a nation's wealth, being often indeed substitutes for those material riches which nature has in many cases distributed with so partial a hand. Those nations which remain behind in manufacturing activity, by neglecting the practical applications of the mechanical arts and of industrial chemistry, to the transmission, growth, or manufacture of raw materials—those nations among whom respect for such activity does not pervade all classes—must inevitably fall from any prospe-

rity they may have attained; and this by so much the more certainly and speedily as neighbouring States, instinct with the power of youthful renovation, in which science and the arts of industry operate or lend each other mutual assistance, are seen pressing forward in the race."

Assuming, then, as an incontestable truth, and one admitted by the nation, that abstract science is necessary to the improvement and perfection of the practical arts, and that it is required from the student in the new College of Industry, we come to the discussion of a question not less important than any we have been considering. From what quarter are we to obtain the abstract science which we need, and how are we to obtain it in the largest quantity and of the best quality? Science is an article of which a certain quantity is produced annually in every civilized nation. It has therefore two forms—that which is *imported*, and that which is *indigenous*. Our imported science is introduced directly into this country in scientific journals, and in the memoirs of foreign academies, and indirectly in scientific instruments and apparatus manufactured abroad. These books and these instruments are taxed by an import duty, the one by *weight* and the other by *value*; so that the science which we have been lauding as the mainstay of our arts is actually a prohibited article, and prohibited, too, by the consent of the very legislators who are commissioners for the establishment of our industrial colleges! But when our imported books, and memoirs, and journals, and instruments, reach the learned individuals, who either purchase them, or receive them gratuitously from their authors, or from the academies of which they are members, they would be of little avail to art, and of as little use for public instruction, unless they were translated into our own language, and either published separately, or diffused through the nation in our scientific journals. It is well known, however, that a book of abstract science will not sell in this country owing to the heavy imposts upon knowledge—the tax upon the paper upon which it is printed, and the tax upon the advertisements which are required to make it known to the public. For the same reasons our scientific journals are unable to afford the expense of translations and abstracts from the scientific productions of foreign countries, and of the diagrams and plates which are so frequently necessary for their illustration. The consequence of this is, that we have not in England, or Scotland, or Ireland a single Journal of Science, or Magazine of Art of the least merit

—either well conducted, well illustrated, or well circulated; and those which we have are neither patronized nor read by the nobility and gentry of the land, and scarcely looked into even by those who are most deeply interested in the advancement of science, both theoretical and practical. Hence our imported science is kept in bond through the apathy of our legislators, maintaining scientific ignorance among the people, and checking the progress of science and the industrial arts. Thus hostile to *imported* science, we should expect that our statesmen would be very friendly to that which is *indigenous*. But here, too, the ignorance and illiberality of our Governments stand in painful contrast with the wisdom and generosity of those of every other nation. Instead of being encouraged, our indigenous science labours under disabilities, as if an article of contraband, which it is the interest of the State to seize, or an immoral importation, which it is their duty to suppress. If important discoveries require for their description and illustration to be consigned in elaborate memoirs, our voluntary associations of philosophers, with limited means at their command, cannot afford to publish them; or if they can, they may possibly refuse, because their publication may interfere with the scientific claims of some of themselves or their functionaries. If the author desires or is obliged to publish his discoveries in a separate work, no bookseller will hazard the expense of printing and illustrating a volume, the sale of which will hardly repay the duty on paper and advertisements with which it is taxed. The consequence of all this is, that many English philosophers write books and memoirs of great learning and value which are never published, and others would willingly write them, were there any probability of their paying, as they do in foreign countries, the expense of publication.

If, on the other hand, our indigenous science is enshrined in a process, or instrument, or machine, which has required years for its elaboration or construction, the law will seize the property, as belonging to the public, if the confiding inventor has accidentally allowed his secret to transpire, or employed a faithless assistant to aid him in his labours.* As justly might the bystander appropriate the purse of gold that has dropped from his sovereign's hand, or the slave merchant claim the white child that has strayed from its home. But even if the in-

ventor has kept his secret, by making use of no other hands but his own—a work of extreme difficulty, and itself injurious to the development of his invention or discovery—he must purchase a fourteen years' right of receiving any benefit from his labours, by paying in exchange for that right the sum of £176, (at present till the 1st of October 1852, between £300 and £500,) the public being put in possession of all the results of his invention, which it may have cost him many hundred pounds to secure. Some liberal friend or generous benefactor may perchance assist the poor inventor to discharge the preliminary debt; but no sooner does he send his invention into the market, or offer licenses for the use of his instrument or process, than he is assailed by pirates, who openly rob him of his invention, on the ground of some trivial defect in his specification, or on the allegation that he has not clearly described his invention, or that it has been somewhere described before. If our indigenous science then is proscribed, in place of being fostered, by our Patent Laws, and if it is admitted on all hands that it is required by our industrial institutions as the mother and companion of art, some arrangements must be made to supply it in due abundance and of the requisite quality. It will no doubt be said, that we have the Royal Society and the other scientific institutions of the Empire engaged in the prosecution of abstract science, and the School of Mines actively occupied in the same cause. Referring to former articles,* in which we have pointed out the defects of all voluntary associations, and especially our own, let us consider for a moment how such institutions must work in reference to the advancement of science. Those who labour for the Royal Society, for example, namely, the philosophers who contribute to its transactions, are its own members principally, or those who might be its members if they could afford it. These individuals, to whom, as well as to the active and unpaid officers of the society, the country is under the deepest obligations, carry on the researches to which accident or their own individual tastes may have directed them, consign the result of their labours in the Society's Transactions. Whole branches of science, such as those pointed out by Sir John Herschell,† are thus entirely neglected, and not even pursued in the Empire. Now this is an undoubted and essential feature in all voluntary institutions, and it is impossible to remedy the evil un-

* The late Lord Eldon, in the trial of a patent right, declared, that if he intended to take out a patent for an invention, he would not confide the secret of it even to his brother.

* See this Journal, vol. vii. p. 139, and vol. xiv. p. 126, and Mr. Babbage's two works on the Decline of Science, and on the Exposition of 1851, *passim*.

† See page 286 of this Number, and vol. xiv. p. 128.

less the society had power of appointing committees of their number to devote themselves as in the Institute of France, and other foreign academies, to special departments of science.

In societies supported by an entrance fee, and the annual contributions of its members, amounting in some cases when compounded for to £50 and upwards, the subscription is in reality a tax upon science, and when levied as it is from men of small income, stealing a little leisure for research from their professional avocations, or, what we know to be the case, sacrificing their professional gains on the altar of science, we cannot but view it, though freely paid, as worse than any of the taxes that have ever been levied by financial cupidity; for we must regard it as virtually imposed by the Government that refuses to sustain our scientific institutions. Heavier still does such a tax fall upon the men of genius, who, as Mr. Glaisher* well expresses it, "are content to pass by the beaten tracks to wealth and preferment, and choose that which successfully pursued would lead them to renown," but meeting with obstacles which they cannot surmount, "the far greater number of those who are well qualified by talent, education, and bias, to add to the stores of science and shed lustre on their country, are compelled to turn aside to the smoother paths leading to professions which hold out inducements to their pursuit." In this manner is the staff of science diminished in number and in genius; and the finest and most vigorous minds in the nation, who would light up our manufactures with their science, and supply its brightest fuel to our industry, are thus rusticated in professions whose duties could be sufficiently discharged by inferior minds.

But while want of position scares the young philosopher from the bleak domain of scientific research, there is no motive but that of future fame to allure him from the field where wealth and professional distinction may be surely won. When the honours of the State have been conceded to the most distinguished of our philosophers, they have been of the lowest kind, and instead of being the spontaneous and generous emanations from the seat of power, they are but the withered leaves which faction throws from her own laurelled bust to gratify a political partisan, or perchance to pay by a transferable bond the wages of corruption.

With these facts before us we are driven to the conclusion, that from the voluntary character of our scientific institutions, and

the ignorance and parsimony of our Government, a supply of indigenous science, abundant in quantity and high in quality, cannot be commanded to meet the wants of our new industrial institutions. This therefore is the time for the true patrons of art and industry—the Prince and the Royal Commissioners, to earn a double laurel from their country, by reforming our scientific as well as our industrial institutions. The national feeling developed by the Exhibition marks the time, and the proposed local union of all our societies points to the occasion when this great intellectual revolution should be accomplished. The bold minister who now wields the power of the State, has, at this auspicious moment, promised, through Her Majesty, and declared it to be his duty, to "develop as well as to encourage industry, art, and science." With no common feelings shall we watch the glorious sunrise of which this announcement may be the dawn; and yet not without some mingling fear that the promise thus given to science may be one of those political pledges which are made in weakness and broken in power, or but a passing sentiment which has escaped from the hand of the minister, without having thrilled through his heart. Athwart the darkness of the future the brightest ray of the present but dimly shines, and that sun whose ruddy orb is nearing our horizon may yet rise in darkness deeper than the presaging dawn. We nevertheless confide in the loyalty of the statesman's heart, though we may doubt the strength of his arm. The royal lip, however, has stamped the pledge as sincere: The approbation of the Prince may seal its accomplishment; and with such securities we hail it as an augury of the triumph of British science, and of British industry, and therefore of social wealth and contentment. Our new legislature has yet to endorse the fiat of the Cabinet, and fulfil the desire of the throne; but even if ignorance and faction shall still combine to thwart our intellectual progress, we trust it will never be recorded in history's enduring page, that a British statesman had broken at noon the vow which he had made at midnight,—insulting the sovereign by whose lips that vow was embalmed, and the nation whose hopes it raised, and whose interests it involved.

ART. IX.—1. *Political Elements, or the Progress of Modern Legislation.* By JOSEPH MOSELEY, B.C.L. London, 1852.
2. *On the Method of Observation and Reason-*

* Lectures on the Results of the Exposition. p. 395. See also Babbage's Exposition of 1851, pp. 236, 242.

ing in Politics. By G. CORNEWALL LEWIS.
2 vols. London, 1852.

THE present condition of our "Political Elements" in England, while to the superficial observer it offers little but a scene of chaos and contention, is yet discernible by those who look below the first appearance of things to be fraught with the most hopeful possibilities. Rightly understood, the crisis through which we are now passing is that shattering and crumbling away of the old which necessarily precedes the creation of the new. Rightly used, it is one of those epochs of disruption and transition which should become the seed-time of a nation's future. It is the closing of one chapter in our political history, and should be the opening of another and a brighter page. The questions which have divided parties for the last century are all set at rest; the old battles have been fought and won; the old disputes have died and been buried; everything about which politicians, formerly differed, has either been finally disposed of, or has ceased to be a matter for disagreement; old antagonists and hereditary foes look each other in the face, bewildered to find that the point of contention has vanished from between them; but, having been enemies so long, they fancy they must be enemies still, and so cast about them for new positions of hostility and new points of difference. Instead of rising out of the rut of custom, and hailing with joy the termination of the ancestral war, they deem it necessary to invent or discover topics and pretexts for keeping up at least a semblance of the old antagonism. It is hopeless and unwise, as well as utterly gratuitous, to strive at this day to keep up the old distinctions of Whig and Tory: the vitality has died out of one party: the ground has been cut away from under the other; the old banners of both are torn; the old watchwords of both are meaningless and obsolete; the doctrines of the two are now inextricably blended; and a new opponent has risen up to combat both alike, and to test whatever of truth may yet remain in their principles, or of energy in their attenuated frames.

We may regret this state of things; but we cannot deny it. The old men—the *laudatores temporis acti*—those who live only in the associations and worship only the glories of the past, mourn over the change, and sigh for the days of well-defined Parliamentary armies and of political contests carried on according to the ancient rules of courteous warfare. The younger and the newer race of patriots and statesmen rejoice at the prospect of a time when Parliament shall be an assembly met to deliberate with a single mind,

amicably and in union, on the welfare of a nation equally dear to all—not an arena wherein gladiators struggle for victory over the bleeding body of a prostrate country. But to both alike the *fact* has become obvious. The old Tory party is as extinct as the old Jacobite party. Its culminating point was during the Napoleonic wars: it began to languish with the peace, and every subsequent year dealt it a death wound, till it finally succumbed with Lord Eldon at the date of the Reform Bill. A genuine Tory of the old school is now almost a fossil animal, and at least as rare as the mammoth or the megatherium. The fathers have died out; and the sons have done homage to the spirit of the times. They have taken up a position far in advance of their predecessors: have borrowed something from their former antagonists; have learned much from observation and reflection; and in many things the young Conservatives are more truly liberal and popular than the old Whigs. The old Whigs, again, are effete even more than they are changed; they are out of date; what made them a party is all gone; the popular control of the Crown—Catholic Emancipation—Parliamentary Reform—a foreign diplomacy sympathizing with constitutional government elsewhere,—all these points of policy have been adopted by the nation, and are no longer distinctive of a party. And the principles which were formerly the chief and most honourable characteristics of the Radicals while they were few and powerless, viz.—economy in the public expenditure, the abolition of jobs and abuses, and non-interference with the internal affairs of the Continent, are now proclaimed by all parties alike. The sober among Radicals differ in scarcely an appreciable degree from the more liberal among the Whigs; while between the aristocratic Whigs and the rational and popularizing Conservatives lies only the shadow of a name. Everywhere the old party landmarks are swept away, or stand far out at sea—monuments to shew how far the tide of circumstances and progress has carried all parties alike from the positions they once occupied.

Instead, therefore, of endeavouring artificially to prolong an unnatural and condemned existence, to breathe renewed life into the hollow and decaying carcase of a sham, and to give forced and galvanic motion to things which have no longer a real and self-sustained vitality,—let us unreluctantly allow "the dead past to bury its dead," and, seizing with glad energy upon so rare an opportunity of shaking ourselves free from the shackles of worn-out formulas and hampering engagements, inquire if it be not possi-

ble to suggest some new combinations of the rich "political elements" still left to us, which shall be based upon more real and enduring distinctions, and fruitful of grander and more beneficent results.

The actual state of affairs in the Parliamentary world is felt by all to be neither dignified, satisfactory, nor safe. Representative government is not honoured by the spectacle of the first deliberative assembly in the world floating hither and thither over the sea of legislation without rudder and without compass, blown about by every wind of doctrine, a prey to every manœuvre of faction. Parties and sections seem to be becoming more and more multiplied and fluctuating, and none of them to have any firm position, any fixed policy, any tenacious or enduring bond of union, except, indeed, it be the Manchester School and the Irish "Brigade." While no party has a definite purpose at once high enough to avow and clear enough to follow; while none is strong enough to control or overpower the others, or to pursue an independent and untrimming course; while each, though unable to act itself, is able to fetter and prohibit action to any of its rivals; while the government is too weak to exist except upon sufferance and by connivance, and yet the opposition too unstable and divided to overthrow and replace it;—in such a state of things the feeblest faction rises into dangerous importance, and the wildest project acquires a formidable chance of temporary triumph; individuals, whom an energetic administration or the general good sense of the House renders insignificant and innocuous in ordinary times, become endowed with a tenfold capacity for mischief; casual support is purchased by unworthy concessions, and plans and doctrines are listened to and temporized with, that in better days would be scouted ignominiously and without a hearing. Nor is this the worst: amid party squabbles imperial interests are forgotten or cast into the shade; each faction is so intent on the maintenance of its own position, or the assault of its adversary's camp—so absorbed in the petty tactics of attack and defence—that other and far greater questions, domestic, colonial, and international, are pushed into the background; the question of Chancery reform is postponed to the far inferior one of who shall be the Chancellor; the settlement of our financial system is shoved aside and evaded by the contrivance of a provisional budget; the issue of a nearly balanced division excites more concern than the possibility of a foreign invasion; and friendly powers may be offended, and invaluable colonies alienated and disgusted, because the

instinct of self-preservation engrosses the whole mind and energies of those to whom the welfare of the country has been entrusted.

We should, therefore, deprecate in the strongest manner the continuance of Lord Derby's ministry in office, even if it were in any way likely that the result of the general election should so alter the relative position of parties as to enable them to command a majority on all measures of immediate necessity to the business of the country. We can easily imagine, that while their opponents are divided as now into so many sections, the present ministers might contrive,—by submitting to a life of ingenious stratagems and consummate tact: by pushing forward such measures of reform as the country demands and all parties would concur in supporting; by carefully avoiding all questions which might evoke a general expression of hostile opinion; by postponing or putting aside all proposals on which their defeat would be a matter of certainty; by exciting and bringing into the foreground those discussions which would divide their antagonists, and throwing into the background the topics which would unite them; by attention to all complaints, by courtesy to all suggestions; by a few wise improvements which they might easily introduce into the transaction of public business, and by doing the actual work of office with judgment and despatch,—to acquire a certain small and artificial credit, and to prolong, almost indefinitely, a languid and undignified existence. There are many in the country, we believe, who even wish for such a state of things, men who look to immediate gain and disregard secondary and remote results, who have learned that concessions are most easily wrung from a feeble and tolerated government, and who set a high value on the steps towards reform, and the irrevocable admissions in favour of reform, which a Conservative administration is compelled to make in order to retain its power. They observe that a liberal party generally becomes timid and reactive when in office, and is supported by a Tory opposition in its timidity and reaction; whereas the Tory party always becomes reforming and liberal when in office, and is aided and dragged forward in its liberalizing course by the reforming opposition. Thus reform, they say, always advances faster under the rule of its enemies than of its friends. There is some truth and some wisdom in the policy of those who reason thus; but it is partial truth and a short-sighted policy. The immediate advantage is perceived: but the price at which it is purchased is kept out of sight. There is no doubt that of late years the Conservatives

have always improved in office and the Whigs in opposition. But this improvement may be dearly bought by a lowering of the standard of public morality, and by a corrupt, careless, or reactionary spirit systematically pervading the distribution of appointments.

An Administration has three sets of functions to perform—three classes of duties which the country expects from it,—viz., a wise general legislative policy; a skillful management of the business of the various Government departments; and a judicious and patriotic distribution of its patronage. The importance of this last branch of ministerial duty is seldom sufficiently estimated. A Cabinet may do this well, and other matters ill. A Government may be timid and ineffective in its general action; its legislative schemes may be imperfect and ill-concocted; it may manage the official routine of administration with a somewhat lax and unpractised hand; and yet it may be preferable to its rivals, and it may be important to retain it in power, at all events for a time, because its appointments are carefully, sagaciously, and honestly made. Or the converse of this proposition may be just. It is no trifling matter whether the immense patronage of the Government—especially in the higher class of appointments—shall be in the hands of men who, whatever their feebleness or their faults, earnestly desire progress, ardently love freedom, and conscientiously endeavour to find the fittest candidates for every post;—or in the hands of men whose hearts are in the past, who dread the march of mind, who abhor all mental liberty and daring, the whole spirit of whose policy would, though unavowedly, be steadily and systematically reactionary, and whose whole weight would be thrown into the scale of absolutism, at home and abroad. It is impossible to over-estimate the gradual and silent influences of good, or bad, appointments to the episcopate, to the bench, to the magistracy, to the government of colonies, to the inspectorship of schools, to the multitude of other posts at the disposal of the Executive,—in educating, inoculating, and regenerating the nation,—or the reverse. It is no slight matter that each vacancy among the bishops should be filled up by Ministers who will appoint a Stanley or a Sumner, instead of a Philpotts or a Wilberforce; that the many hundred livings in the gift of the Crown should be conferred on clergymen who will carry the olive-branch of peace, instead of the torch of discord, into their respective parishes, who will attach, instead of alienating, the hearts of an earnest and inquiring generation. It is no trivial question whether a

flood of rational piety, or a flood of rampant Puseyism—a religion of blessing, or a religion of cursing—shall be poured, year after year, over the land. It makes no small difference whether the judges who are elevated to the bench shall be lawyers who are bigoted to every old enormity, or lawyers who are earnest in favour of every beneficent reform—men like Eldon, or men like Romilly. It is no slight matter whether the magistrates who administer justice in the first resort, shall be of a character to make the law loved and respected, or hated and despised—whether they shall be real “justices of the peace,” or mere persecutors of vagrants and of poachers. In the course of a few years, the different effects produced on the education of the people, by school-inspectors appointed for their wide sagacity, and school-inspectors appointed only for their narrow orthodoxy, will have been incalculable. And, finally, who can pretend to estimate the mighty and contrasted consequences which would be wrought on our colonial empire, our national strength, the happiness, prosperity, and loyalty of our numerous dependencies, by a series of governors sent out by a Reforming or a Tory administration—a series of governors like Lord Dalhousie and Lord Elgin, or like Captain Fitzroy and Lord Torrington? Yet all these differences might, and to a great extent probably would, be produced by a simple change of the men who sat in Downing Street. The indirect influence of the real ingrained principles held by the members of the Cabinet, is often far greater and wider than their direct action. On this account we deprecate the continuance of the present Ministers in power.

We deprecate it, further, on the ground of public morality and Parliamentary honour, which of late years have received so many severe shocks. We have seen a Ministry come into power on the ground of the necessity of “the appropriation clause,” and resign that ground after they had been a year in office. We have seen a Ministry appointed and a Parliament elected, for the object of defeating the policy of commercial freedom, and end in carrying out that policy in its fullest meaning. We have seen a third Ministry unseat its antagonists on the question of a coercion bill for Ireland, and almost immediately find themselves compelled to propose a still more stringent one themselves. And if the country now allows a fourth Ministry to retain, as free-traders, offices which they have sought and obtained as Protectionists, it will have made itself a *particeps criminis*, and will have given its sanction to a system discreditable now, and ominous of future evil.

There is no worse augury for a nation's welfare than the prevalence of a low tone of public morality. Nothing is a surer indication of decline; nothing a more certain pre-
 sage of approaching ruin. Where great criminals are leniently dealt with, and great crimes meet only with gentle and modified condemnation; when the past, however disreputable, is readily forgiven at the first promise of an amended future; when the prodigal son is promptly and without question welcomed back, though low tastes dictated the prodigality, and flagrant selfishness alone suggested the return; when a long and obstinate persistence in wrong is held to be cancelled by a month of tardy and convenient repentance; and when all the mischief wrought by a life of error can be atoned for and blotted out by final obeisance to the majesty of truth,—there is much reason to fear that a dangerous laxity is beginning to undermine those principles of right among statesmen and politicians which are the strongest safeguards of our national interests and honour. The idea that it is never too late to amend, and to reap the full reward of amendment, is no doubt a prodigious comfort to the frail and erring; but it is also a dreadful encouragement to the shrewd and calculating sinner to continue in his iniquity as long as the balance of immediate advantage seems to be in his favour. We can quite understand the unhesitating readiness with which all who are earnest in the pursuit of a great object will naturally hail the arrival of every recruit desirous of being enlisted in the same cause, without too close or severe an inquiry into his antecedents. We can sympathize to a great extent with the credulous cordiality which welcomes every fresh convert to our views, and thinks it ungracious to question the sincerity or the motives of the conversion. In the one case, the assistance brought to our cause, in the other, the homage paid to our doctrines, dispose us to think as well as possible of the superficial convert or the hollow ally; and in the immediate gain we are too apt to overlook and under-estimate the remote and insidious mischief. Our mistake, to use the words of Sir James Mackintosh, is that of "too readily allowing exceptions to general rules; that of too easy a permission of the use of doubtful means where the end seems to us good; that of believing, unphilosophically as well as dangerously, that there *can* be any scheme or measure as beneficial to the State, as the mere existence of men who would not do a base act for any public advantage."

For a long period we were too much

given to idolize **CONSISTENCY** in our public men. Adherence to party, even when the party pursued an unprincipled course—adherence to former opinions, even when those opinions had become untenable, was long regarded as constituting the first and most sacred duty of a statesman. Change of opinion, or desertion of colleagues, was the one sin for which there was no forgiveness. A politician's obligation to his country was a tradesman's debt, which he ought to pay if he could: his obligations to his party were a debt of honour, which it was unpardonable not to discharge. Reflection and circumstances have greatly modified our feelings on this matter, and the tendency is now to run into the opposite extreme. Party ties have been so much broken up; changes of opinion have been so frequent, so serviceable, and so well defended; the education both of the nation and of statesmen has proceeded so rapidly of late, that the strangest tergiversations and conversions excite no surprise and little animadversion; and, provided only the change be in the right direction, we are too ready to accept it as genuine and meritorious—even if it be tardy to a shameful degree, and timely to a most suspicious extent,—and to pass a general act of indemnity and oblivion for all the past. We must raise our voice against this tendency, as the offspring of a lax morality, and pregnant with much future danger.

Every individual change of policy or recantation of opinion on the part of leading public men, must stand upon its own merits: of the simple fact of inconsistency little, either good or bad, can be predicated. Each case must be judged by its antecedents and its concomitants. There have been, within recent recollection, some changes so rational, so gradual, so grounded on new knowledge, wider experience, and deeper study, so justified by the purest motives and the clearest necessity, so obviously honest because attended with much mortification, and punished by severe penalties,—that we class them among the most indisputable sacrifices of patriotic virtue. Such was that of Sir Robert Peel from 1842 to 1846. And there have been some recantations, also in the right direction, but so sudden, so audacious, so utterly unbased upon any additional facts, so inexcusable on the common plea of previous want of inquiry, so apparently traceable only to the one circumstance of altered position,—that it is impossible for the widest charity to elevate them into merits, or to give absolution to the subject of them. Such, it appears to us, was Mr. Disraeli's homage of adhesion to the princi-

ples and consequences of the financial policy of his antagonists, as displayed in his celebrated speech on the budget.

We can make every allowance for the case of those politicians who are *born* into a particular set of opinions, who inherit them from their parents, or imbibe them insensibly from their early associates. They have for years been accustomed to *take for granted* that their friends were right, and their adversaries wrong; they have been in the habit of hearing and repeating the stock arguments on their own side of the question, without ever dreaming of the unsoundness of them; and have never regarded the subject from their opponents' point of view. Hence, when new party combinations, or the increasing dangers of the country, compel them for the first time really to investigate matters with the single purpose of discovering the truth, and they perceive that they have all their life been unconsciously living on shallow fallacies, they are placed in a most embarrassing position. And if they candidly avow their error, we give them ready and generous absolution, approve heartily their final deviation into right, and reserve whatever blame must necessarily attach to them for their former inconsiderateness, not for their present retraction.

Again: when a man has from any accident been thrown among a political party, whose notions and sentiments are un congenial to his own; when the entanglement of personal ties or family connexions have long held him in that species of unwilling thralldom which it is particularly difficult for a sensitive and honourable man to escape from; when his whole career has been, though often unconsciously, a ceaseless struggle for emancipation; when on all occasions he has advocated those views of his party which, by their moderation, approached most nearly to those of the party which his false position obliged him to oppose; when his *tendencies* have always been obvious, and always in the same direction; and when, year after year, he has proceeded, casting off shackle after shackle, abjuring error after error, till his mind was ripe and the hour was come for the crowning, public, and decisive metastasis;—then we recognise in him no fitting subject for animadversion or reproach, but hail and applaud his final conversion as the matured fruit of a tree which has long been growing beneath our sight.*

We are even inclined to treat leniently, and to put the best construction upon an

other and very frequent cause of tergiversation. Many public men have taken up their opinions, if not hastily, yet at all events without due deliberation; they have fought for them zealously, but not always with a zeal according to knowledge; they have examined them, where they have examined at all, with the strong bias of a foregone conclusion; while in opposition, they have urged their views upon ministers with reckless heat and inconsistent confidence; but as soon as they are invested with the insignia and sobered by the cares of office, and are called upon to *act* upon their former principles, and therefore to reinvestigate them with all the new lights and under all the weighty responsibilities of power—they find, to their surprise, their confidence abated, their convictions becoming less vehement and dogmatic, and their former courage fast evaporating under the burden of ministerial obligations. For the first time in their life they sit down honestly to investigate matters with the real and sole determination to arrive at truth and fact; and for the first time they begin to perceive how deplorably mistaken they have hitherto been. It is not that the possession of office has supplied them with any *sinister* motives to a change of opinion; but that it has made them for the first time sincere, earnest, and unblinded inquirers. They were honest before: they are honest now; but before, they talked recklessly—now, they reflect cautiously. Their sin lies in their past, not in their present, conduct: they are culpable, not for acting and speaking *now* under an overpowering sense of duty and responsibility, but for having hitherto forgotten that opposition has its responsibilities as well as office, and that every public man, whatever be his position, owes to his country the purest and most conscientious exercise of all his faculties. Public life is equally a post of trust, whether on the right or the left hand of the Speaker's chair; and a senator who does not deem it necessary to be sound and true in his counsels till he is in office, forms a very low and vulgar estimate of his moral obligations.

But none of the above grounds for putting a favourable construction on a Statesman's tergiversation, can be considered applicable to the strange recantation made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer in his budget speech and his address to his constituents—especially the former. The financial policy, of which in that speech he so powerfully, lucidly, and gratuitously displayed the beneficial operation, is, we cannot forget, the policy which, for the last six years and up to the previous three months, he had been in the

* "The first inconstancy of unripe years
Is Nature's error on its way to truth."

Edwin the Fair, by Henry Taylor.

habit of vehemently denouncing as mistaken in principle and ruinous in its results. The facts which he stated to the house on that memorable Friday, are precisely the facts which year after year his opponents have been pressing on his attention. The conclusions which flow from these facts were as manifest and inescapable, and must have been as obvious to him in 1851 as in 1852. He cannot plead that his mind has never been strongly directed to the subject till now, for it is the subject on which he has been harping session after session, which has occupied the chief share of his attention and research, and which he has turned over and over, and handled with every conceivable manœuvre of perverse ingenuity. If he never examined it seriously and dispassionately till now, he has throughout been acting a most unworthy part; if, having so examined it, he came to Protectionist conclusions, how comes it that now in office he sees the matter in such a very different light? If, again, having so examined it, and seen then as he sees now, the hollowness of the Protectionist doctrines, he yet upheld them as a party weapon, then we say that history scarcely affords a more glaring example of double treachery—treachery to the political phalanx which he led—treachery to the country of which he was a sworn and chosen legislator.

We have no desire ever to make the retraction of error difficult, or the retreat from a false position unnecessarily painful and humiliating. We are willing to conclude that Mr. Disraeli's allegiance to the principles we have long defended is genuine and final, and assuredly should be sorry to hunt him back to his former follies. We believe the views which it is impossible, in spite of all mystification, not to imagine were developed as his own in his budget-speech, to be the sincere and inevitable views of a man who regards these questions from the position, with the light, and under the grave responsibilities of office. But in admitting this, we can give Mr. Disraeli no absolution for his obstinate and wilful persistence in the advocacy of untenable opinions; and we can only acquit him of the most frightful and prolonged insincerity, by supposing him guilty of a degree of thoughtless levity in his mode of regarding and treating the great interests of the nation, which must for ever disqualify him for the position of a leading Statesman, and preclude him from obtaining the confidence of the English people.

Nor can we for a moment allow to pass, as becoming or admissible, the language which has on several occasions been held, both by Lord Derby and his lieutenant,

"that, whatever be his own opinions, a statesman must conform to the spirit of his age;" "that such and such a line of policy would be the just and wise one, but that the country is not sufficiently alive to its justice or its wisdom to adopt it, and therefore that another system must be followed." Cases no doubt occur in all countries governed by free institutions, in which acquiescence in the will of the nation, or even in the deliberate decision of an adverse majority, is the clear duty of a statesman. Laws are often passed which even those who opposed them most energetically would not dream of repealing. Laws are often repealed, which those who defended them most stoutly would not dream of re-enacting. It may often be wise and right to accept a defeat as final and conclusive. Sir Robert Peel did this in the case of the Reform Bill, to which he had offered the most strenuous opposition. He bowed to the manifest determination of the country, and at once abjured all attempt to disturb it. "I accept that measure (said he) as the final settlement of a great constitutional question." Nor would it be a just or wise principle to lay down, that the opponents of a great revolution in our national policy are to be held disqualified from taking office under the new system of things which that change has introduced. Such perpetual exclusion from power of any class of statesmen is a thing foreign to our constitution, and would, in our opinion, be far from salutary. Conservative politicians may even be peculiarly valuable at the helm of affairs, when progress has been established as the principle and pole-star of the country's policy, provided only their former opposition to that principle was rational and patriotic, and their present acquiescence in it honest and without *arrière pensée*. But the language held by the present ministers, and the conduct they seem disposed to follow, can be justified by none of these considerations. They never acquiesced in the free-trade policy inaugurated by Huskisson, continued by Sir R. Peel, and completed by their immediate predecessors. They never "accepted" the crowning enactment of 1846 "as the final settlement of a great constitutional question." On the contrary, they have repeatedly and incessantly declared it to be erroneous in principle and ruinous in its results; they have been perpetually endeavouring to undermine it, and defeat it by flank attacks, and have lost no opportunity of assuring the people that, if entrusted with power, they would reverse it. Had they, after so obstinate a contest as they waged in 1846, submitted to their defeat, and bowed gracefully to the decision of the country, there could be no reason why

they should not now have formed an administration with credit and with promise. But they did not pursue this course; they kept themselves before the country as a Protectionist party; they solicited confidence and support on Protectionist principles; they took office as a Protectionist ministry; their cabinet was composed of men having no claim to confidence or attention, except as Protectionists; and for such men to say to the country—"We will retain power to upset and neutralize free trade, if you will enable us; or, if not, we will still retain power to consolidate it and carry it out," seems to us language alike without spirit and without shame. It is true that in England no statesman can bid defiance "to the spirit of the age," nor pursue a policy condemned by the opinion of the nation; but no honest men can be bound, or can bear, to carry out a policy which they regard, and have all along denounced as fatal to the nation's welfare; if the nation insists upon being ruined, they at least should refuse to be the instruments of its ruin. No statesman, with a particle of self-respect—none worthy to guide or govern a great people—would address them thus,—“Place me in power, that I may lead you to safety if I am allowed; but if this cannot be, place me in power, that I may at least be your leader to destruction!” When the country and the statesmen differ so widely as to what is salvation, and what is ruin, the dignity and duty of the statesman is not acquiescence, but retirement.

Finally, we deprecate the continuance of the present ministers in office, because we do not believe in their capacity to manage the affairs of a great empire. Lord Derby has been a prominent public character for a quarter of a century, but has never shone except in parliamentary warfare. Mr. Disraeli's *cleverness* no one doubts; but steadiness of purpose, dignity of conduct, or lofty and consistent principles, are what his antecedents give us no right to expect from him. The Home Secretary is an able, sincere, and conscientious lawyer, whom every one respects, but who has no experience in public life, and whose reputation has not risen since he took office. Of the rest, the best that can be said is, that they are unknown men—and likely to remain so. On the whole, it is probable that sixteen more incompetent men never sat in the Cabinet together. During the few months they have sat on the Treasury Bench, their blunders and solecisms have been many and glaring, and the proceedings of the Foreign Secretary have been utterly suicidal and self-damnatory. Even if they had a decided policy, and if that policy were sound, the credit, honour, and

safety of the country would require a speedy transference of power to more competent and experienced hands.

But if we deprecate the continuance in office of Lord Derby's ministry, we should deprecate with scarcely less earnestness a revival of the former administration—especially under its former leader. At the point of time and of progress at which we are now arrived, Whig Government can never be else than an un-reality: no genius can henceforth breathe into it any other than a feeble, artificial, and spasmodic life. A Reforming party is a permanent *reality*: a Whig party is only its accidental and transitory *form*. To struggle for the preservation of the form is to endanger the more valuable reality. We should be among the last to deny or to under-estimate the services rendered to the dearest interests of England by the great aristocratic Whig party during the century of its existence. It has kept a wholesome control over its rivals, and has saved them from many follies and from some crimes. It has supplied a rich galaxy of eminent and noble statesmen to our history; it has consolidated and widened both our civil and our religious liberties; it has stood between the living and the dead in fearful moments of pestilence and danger; it has at once ridden on and moderated the wave of popular demand, and has changed what might have been a bloody and abortive insurrection into a peaceful and salutary revolution; it has been like an Ark to our Constitution during a deluge of no ordinary violence and no short duration. But we do not read that Noah felt himself called upon, out of gratitude, to live in the ark after the deluge had subsided. We do not testify our sense of the services of the bows and spears which scattered our enemies at Agincourt and Crecy, by furbishing them up for the battles of to-day. We do not shew our respect for the superannuated veterans who fought half a century ago, by intrusting our defence *now* to their impaired vision and their enfeebled strength. We pension off the old warriors, and we hang up the antiquated armour and the rusty firelocks which won our ancestral victories, and shew our gratitude by tender reverence, not by untimely use. The worst way in which we can repay the services of patriots and statesmen who have swayed and adorned their day and generation, is by retaining them in a position in which they can only tarnish their former fame, and obliterate and cancel the memory of their former deeds. Now, everything which made the Whigs a party is told off into the historic past; their part is performed; the arena in which they distinguished them-

selves is changed; their arms and their banners are alike obsolete; their bonds of union are broken or dissolved; the timid and reactionary among them are Conservatives; the sanguine and enterprising among them are "something more" than Whigs; and a graceful euthanasia—a deathbed made beautiful by the devotion of a few clinging adherents unable to believe in the extinction of what was once so great—is all now left them. A resurrection, under new conditions, of the great Whig party, may be possible: a prolongation of its existence is not. Like its nobler prototype, "it cannot be quickened except it die."

Least of all is its revival possible or desirable under its late leader. Though an experienced tactician—a gallant and chivalrous colleague—a high-minded and honourable senator, Lord John Russell was the most complete partisan of his whole party. He worshipped Whig idols; he lived on Whig traditions; he measured everything by Whig compasses; he looked at everything through Whig spectacles; and could seldom rise high enough above the ideas and interests of party warfare, to contemplate any subject from a purely patriotic point of view. Since the commencement of the present year, too, his usual skill and judgment seem to have deserted him. His dismissal of his ablest colleague at a moment when difficulties of every kind were thickening around him; his violation of all constitutional courtesies and decorums, in producing the Queen's letter when justifying that dismissal; his unpardonable mistake in advising the Queen to intrust the formation of a new Government to Lord Derby when he saw fit to throw up the reins; and, lastly, the glaring factiousness and sudden whim of his opposition to the second reading of the Militia Bill, to the utter amazement and confusion of his own party, who, for the most part, refused to follow him in so indefensible a step;—all have contributed to lower him deplorably, and we fear irreparably, in public estimation. Had he at the time of his own resignation suppressed all natural feelings of pique and indignation—had he consented, as the French say, *de s'effacer*, and advised Her Majesty to send for Lord Clarendon, or Sir James Graham, or Lord Palmerston—which would have been the constitutional course to adopt, since his defeat was not owing to a Protectionist assault—the country might have arrived at the desirable result of a strong and united Government, without having to pass through the dangerous and damaging ordeal of a ministry whose foreign policy is conducted by Lord Malmesbury, and whose finances are man-

aged by Benjamin Disraeli—without being subjected to all the evils of a feeble Government in a crisis of singular *exigence*, and of a general election in a period of angry excitement.

Since, then, the interests, desires, and requirements of the country cannot be satisfied either by the continuance of the present ministry or by a recurrence to the former one, it remains only clearly to state what is the real desideratum of the time, and by what political combinations that desideratum can be supplied.

In a free and parliamentary Government, like that of England, there are two parties, inherent and undying—the Stationary and the Progressive—the party whose principle is Conservatism, and the party whose principle is Reform. The parties themselves are eternal: the forms, disguises, combinations, pretexts, battle-fields, they may assume are accidental and transitory. Their ideas are distinct, and too often antagonistic; they attract different orders of mind; they look at questions from opposite points of view; they are each the representatives of a truth—but a truth that is partial and imperfect till it has found its complement and counterpart.

The principle of Progress or Reform (as Mr. Moseley has well stated) is both instinctive and sound.

"It is the means by which the higher destiny of man has to be worked out. The doctrine of contentment—the proverb of 'leave well alone,' and such like, acting exclusively—is peculiarly that of the lower grades of the creation. In its full extent it is at variance with the first principle of the physical temperament of man as an individual; and, if carried out, were fatal to the destiny of man as a race. . . . Again, the principle of progress is boundless, endless in its operation; there is no moment of cessation; its work is never done. It may be weakened by the toil it imposes on itself, but never satisfied—never extinguished; for that which it longs after and lives for—perfection—is never to be enjoyed—never to be realized. Improvement in political wellbeing, as in other wellbeing, but leaves us still with desires—with the power of discerning further means of satisfying itself—new hopes—greater power, and consciousness of power, for achieving them."

The principle which lies at the bottom of Conservatism, too, is equally instinctive, equally necessary, equally legitimate. It may often run into excess; it may often assume unamiable forms; it may often cling round unworthy objects; it may often manifest itself in unwise and untimely ebullitions; but at its root lies a beneficent and indisputable truth. There is the Conservatism of mere indolence, which shrinks from the effort

and disturbance of a change, and hates to be aroused from its torpid and unserviceable slumber. There is the Conservatism of selfishness, which, finding that the existing state of things supplies its own low wants and satisfies its own small ideal, cares not how many millions might be made happy by a just and judicious innovation. There is the Conservatism of timidity, which clings to the familiar and the safe; which fears to launch upon an untried sea; and finds the most sanguine and brilliant prospect of a better, inadequate to counterbalance the faintest possibility of a worse. There is the Conservatism of poetry, which measures political good by sentiment and impression; in whose votaries the feeling of veneration is stronger than that of aspiration; and which can deck the past more readily than the future with the gorgeous colouring of fancy. But there is also the Conservatism of wisdom, which knows how much there is of strength and virtue in the rooted and old,—how much of danger and illusion in the gaudy attractions of the new; which sees the price even more clearly than the blessing which it purchases; which sits down to count the cost before it builds the tower; and which has learned by long experience how often the substance is risked by grasping at the more seductive shadow. In fact, the principle of Conservatism is less a negation and antagonist of the principle of Progress than a different side of the same shield—the other half of the same truth.

"We have seen," says Mr. Moseley, "that Reform and Conservatism are true principles of all good government—that both are essential constituents of it. But the parties formed on these doctrines are severally combinations for carrying out—for giving effective operation to—one only of these; or at least for giving to one a dominant, preponderating, if not exclusive, influence in the government of the country. Each of these parties, then, is grounded on a false theory. All who claim a truth exclusively as their own, or who profess to take one great truth as their rule of action, when the other, at least—though it be the antithesis of their own—is an essential principle of such government, place themselves in a false position. And all combinations formed on such a basis must be untrue to themselves, and deceive those who place confidence in them."

Bearing in mind these considerations, we will now cast a glance over the *real* parties into which the English political world is now divided, ignoring those divisions which, though still ostensible, are merely or almost nominal, and passing over those minor but numberless distinctions which can never be absent among a nation of independent thinkers.

First, there are the Old Tories—the relics and survivors of the party that, so lately as thirty years ago, was dominant and rampant. They are few in number, and far from standing high in public estimation; but they are not therefore to be altogether despised, and must not be overlooked among the elements of political calculations. In some parts of England, and among some classes, they have still great influence; they are often men of vast possessions and of attractive character; and, what is of still more consequence, there are several of their opinions with which the great mass of refined and cultivated English gentlemen have a ready and deep-seated, though a modified and tempered sympathy. They represent a permanent element in the national mind—they are the depositaries and expounders of a certain set of sentiments and ideas which are eminently British;—antique loyalty; unreasoning, and often irrational, attachment to the Church as an institution; instinctive *vis inertiae*; veneration for ancestral times; and hatred of *parvenus* and *parvenuism*. A few of these are to be found in the House of Commons—more in the House of Lords. They can never again govern the country: democracy and commerce are now both too strong;—but they can never be wholly without influence over those who do.

At the other extremity of the political gamut lies the Radical party, now almost merged in the Manchester School. This section is composed of men who are both numerous and influential; but whose numbers and influence are greater out of Parliament than in. They are men whom it would be well worth while for our Statesmen thoroughly to study and understand. They may be most useful, or most formidable, according as they are met and dealt with. They are men of unwearied activity and dauntless pertinacity. They have all the concentrated and unhampered energy which springs from earnest purpose and clear but narrow vision. They feel strongly and speak vehemently; because their knowledge is not thorough and their reflection is not deep. To them, every political difficulty is simple, every labyrinth plain, every problem easy of solution. They delight in and promulgate those broad views which are so seductive to presumptuous and uneducated masses—so shallow, so short-sighted, so dangerous, in the judgment of trained and thoughtful minds. They have, in their character and conformation, much of the Yankee and something of the Puritan—a combination most sure to command success, and most especially to be dreaded where the profound and subtle questions of the higher policy are at stake. In

their eyes, everything that is old has a *prima facie* case against it; every thing new, at least a high degree of probability in its favour. They have a quick eye and a keen satire for all past mistakes; and have no modesty or caution to make them shrink from the boldest experiments. They have a vivid perception of all that is indefensible in theory, but are wholly without appreciation for the hidden compensations and counteractions which have caused even monstrous systems to produce valuable results. Their most valuable characteristic is their merciless and rude hostility to all abuses and all shams; their most pernicious quality is their disposition to try every thing by the lowest and most mercenary standard. They would overturn, without fear, the whole traditional policy of the nation; and, while unable to rise to a statesmanlike contemplation of Imperial questions, are prepared to set at nought international customs, to abjure all foreign relations, and to reverse and confound all colonial connexions. To some among them, the increased predominance of the democratic element in our Constitution is only a means towards the attainment of their ends; to others, it is an object of desire for its own sake; but by all it is steadily pursued. All are the advocates of vital and organic changes.

Between these two extremes stands the vast Eclectic party, neither conterminous with, nor represented by, any of the official and antique divisions in the Parliamentary chart—whether Whigs, Radicals, or Tories. It is composed of deserters from every section, and of men who never belonged to any section. It has been long, and of late rapidly, augmenting, and is now more numerous than any other, though its members are still scattered up and down in the ranks of every political denomination, from the want of a common banner and a central leader to rally round. As soon as such shall be found, its surpassing strength, both numerical, intellectual, and social, will be at once recognised. It comprises all those, bred in the old Tory camp, whose enlarged education had shown them at once the narrowness of their paternal creed, and the no less untenable nature of the positions from which even what is true and sound in it has hitherto been defended; who have discovered that the retention of the old, without its modification and adaptation to an altered age, is only half the idea of a philosopher and half the duty of a statesman; and who are sincerely and nobly desirous to remove—even at their own cost and at the sacrifice of many prejudices—those abuses which have disfigured venerable institutions, and those ex-

crecences and incrustations which have overgrown and hidden so much that is genuine, beautiful, and divine, in the hallowed legacies of the past. It comprises numbers among the Whigs, who are sick of an artificial bond, and weary of a hollow sham, and who dread the increasing temptation and tendency among their leaders to purchase a new lease of life by unworthy coquetting and unholy alliances with a party with whom their sympathies are only limited, casual, and apparent. It comprises, too, many who, while ardently attached to the cause of progress and reform, yet fear the advance of democracy, as of the two opposing dangers the most formidable and the most imminent; and who are anxious to resist it, not by obstruction and reaction towards the past, but by forestalling all its just demands, and so cutting away the ground from beneath its feet. It comprises, further, not a few, formerly known as zealous leaders in the vanguard of Radicalism, whose early illusions time and experience have dissipated, to whom age has brought sobriety of expectation, whom observation and reflection have made aware of perils and difficulties undreamed of in their sanguine youth, and who, while true at heart to the real and enduring attributes of their old idolatry, yet bring a purer oblation and worship at a statelier shrine. Its ranks are swelled by all those who, having conquered, one by one, every object for which they fought, having carried all the reforms they sought and valued, have now passed by a natural and legitimate transition from the body of assailants into that of defenders of the existing order of things. It includes, again, those experienced and influential men who, feeling how much has to be done, and how vast are the obstacles in the way of doing it, finding the day too short and their strength too slight for those practical improvements and those *imperative* reforms in which the immediate interests and welfare of millions are involved, shrink from entertaining the less urgent questions of organic change. Finally, it includes all those—so far more numerous out of Parliament than within its walls—who are turning with angry weariness and contemptuous loathing from party struggles and intellectual tournaments; whose voice is to be heard in every quarter of the empire and through every organ of opinion, calling upon our rulers to look to things, not names; to deeds and laws, not to watchwords and to war-cries; to leave aside and brush away the cobwebs and trivialities of faction; to cease sharpening and changing their tools, and to begin using them; to concentrate all efforts and attention on the real wants of

the country ; to foresee and provide against imperial perils ; to grapple at once in a spirit of business-like and manful resolution with all those social evils and abuses which no one denies and which few defend ; to approach the great questions of the day as problems to be solved at hazard of our national existence, not to seek in them missiles of mutual offence,—in fine, to gird up their loins for the heavy work before them, like men to whose genius, consciousness, and devotion, is entrusted the management of as grand a fragment of human destiny as was ever committed to human hands.

The great demand and desideratum of the country is a **STRONG GOVERNMENT**—a Government imbued with these ideas, and consecrated to these aims—a Government which, exonerated by reason of its strength from the low and wasting necessities of hourly self-defence, should be able to address its whole capacities of conception and of execution, “to do the work that should be done.” Such a Government once formed—its banner raised, its leader chosen, its programme of policy announced—would find itself supported by recruits in unexpected multitudes and from unsuspected quarters. Men, now ranked among Conservatives, because their connexions lie in that line, and they have never yet openly thrown off their allegiance to party ; men classed by public estimation among the Whigs, and reckoned by Whig leaders as forming part of their effective strength, and now acting with that section, partly from old habit, partly from unconsummated change ; men sympathizing with the Radicals on many points, and voting with them on many questions, and never suspected of being Conservatives by temperament and at heart ; all who are weary of unproductive strife, all who are sanguine of practical advance, will flock to the new standard and enlist under the new enrolment.

Who, then, will be the chief, and what should be the policy of this remodelled administration ? The programme of its policy will decide in a great measure the men who are to compose it. As an indispensable preliminary we must suppose Lord John Russell removed to the Upper House. As long as he remains in the House of Commons he will be, we fear, an insuperable obstacle to such a re-organization and combination as the necessities of the country require. While there he is altogether too prominent and powerful not to fill the post of leader, and he cannot be the leader of such an administration as we are now contemplating. When he is removed we see no serious impediments to the formation of a ministry com-

prising, for example, Lord Clarendon, Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Sidney Herbert, the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Granville, Lord Carlisle, Lord Panmure, Mr. Labouchere, Lord Dalhousie, (when he returns,) and possibly Lord Palmerston, as principal members, and Mr. James Wilson, Mr. Cornwall Lewis, the Duke of Argyll, and Mr. Frederick Peel, and others, as secondary colleagues. Such a ministry would be one of conservative progress : the leading principles of their policy would be to grapple at once with those *practical social* questions on which so much of the immediate wellbeing of the country hangs, and to *postpone*, wherever possible, *those measures about which many wise and experienced men differ in favour of those about which nearly all wise and experienced men agree*. In dealing with these latter they will find work enough to engross all their genius, all their industry, all their time, for many years to come. And when they have exhausted the catalogue of those things which every one feels ought to be done, which the national peace, comfort, and character require should be done, many of those questions which are now matters of doubt and discussion will either have solved themselves, or time and experience will have paved the way for a far nearer agreement as to the mode of treating them than is now possible.

Such a cabinet would agree in the essential points of their *foreign policy* : they are all men whose attachment to the principles of constitutional liberty is undoubted, and who yet have never tampered with democratic excess. Their sympathies would, we know, be enlisted on the side of justice, freedom, and humanity abroad, while at the same time they have all repeatedly avowed their adhesion to that great rule which is to govern the international relations of this empire in future—non-interference with the internal affairs of other countries ourselves, and steady, unswerving, severe discouragement of such interference on the part of others. The names of Mr. Gladstone and Lord Carlisle would be an ample intimation to those governments whose brutal cruelty is now the opprobrium of Europe, that from England they could expect only the countenance of deep disgust and the language of unmixed disapprobation ; the presence of Lord Clarendon and Lord Granville would be a guarantee for a conduct of mingled gentleness and firmness ; while the support of Lord Palmerston, which we are satisfied would not be wanting, would be surety enough that the just claims and rights of British subjects would be everywhere watched over and enforced. And more than all,

such a ministry would be able to speak with the confidence and the weight arising from the conviction, both on their own part and on that of foreign governments, that they spoke the sentiments, and were backed by the sympathy, of the whole British nation.

Such a cabinet would agree in the principles of their *financial* and *commercial* policy. They are all resolute free-traders; they are all pledged to carry out, to its full legitimate consequences, the system which they all helped to inaugurate. At the same time they will all be willing to meet the claims of any suffering interest, as soon as the justice of those claims can be made good. On minor points of fiscal arrangements it is possible they may differ; but they are all agreed upon the vast importance, at the present time, of considering deeply, and settling definitely, the fundamental principles on which future taxation should proceed. They will not be content every year to surrender a surplus to the most fierce and noisy claimant for relief—to take off now a trifle in one direction, now a trifle in another; to coquet first with direct, and then with indirect taxation, without any clear comprehension or fixed opinion of the preferable advantages of either; or to base any new impost on the lazy and vicious system of exemptions. They will be anxious to place our future revenue on something like a scientific foundation, feeling that all change in such matters is an evil, but that change guided by fluctuating motives, and proceeding in no uniform direction, is an unmitigated mischief; and before they lightly give away the rare and undervalued treasure of a surplus, they will consider well whether such surplus ought not to be constant, and to be accumulated for purposes of ultimate and permanent relief.

They are agreed on the great and now urgent and hopeful question of *legal reform*. On this some of them are known to be deeply in earnest. With Lord Cranworth or Sir John Romilly as Chancellor, they have, in this line, a career before them, in which they may confer more signal blessings, and reap a richer fame than has fallen to the lot of any ministry for many generations. In the complete extirpation of Chancery enormities; in the extension and consolidation of cheap law courts; in the merciless abolition of the actual ecclesiastical tribunals; in grappling with the vast and difficult question of secondary punishments; in establishing some system for the disposal of juvenile offenders which shall neither shock common sense, common humanity, or common justice,—which shall at once rescue these miserable victims, and take away the motive

to their creation;—lies work sufficient to task all their energies, to satisfy all their aspirations, to occupy all their thoughts; while, as none of these are party questions, and as it would be iniquity to make them such, they may call on all sections of the political world, their opponents as well as their adherents, to aid them, in a spirit not of rivalry, but of collaboration, in toils in which every Englishman has a common and an equal interest.

Next comes the great subject of *Colonial Policy*. This—though much personality has been mixed up with colonial discussions—has scarcely yet become a distinct arena for party strife, and we earnestly trust will never be made so. It presses, not so much for immediate action, as for prompt attention with a view to the determination of principles, and the fixation of views which as yet are, with most men, floating and indefinite. Whether England's colonial empire shall be cut adrift as a burden, or cherished as a jewel, a glory, and a strength; what is the nature and extent of that self-government which should be conceded to the colonies; and what is the fitting time and mode for that concession; whether, while managing their own concerns, as soon as they are qualified to do so, they should be further bound up in our Imperial circle by sending representatives to the Parliament of the mother country; on what basis the relative claims of the settlers and the aborigines are to be adjusted; what amount of protection the colonies can fairly demand from us, and what portion of their defence they must provide for themselves;—all these are questions, though of paramount importance, and of no small difficulty, *rather to be inquired into and studied, than to be fought about* in St. Stephens. They are matters which all may join in helping forward to a decision; and the decision of which will marvellously narrow the future field of faction, and prodigiously aid the development and the peace of the empire.

Surely here is work enough to be done, without looking further into the future, without embarking on the waters of factious bitterness and strife, without raking up the mud that lies at the bottom of the dirty pool of party politics. But there is a question, about which much has been said, and about which something is felt,—a question which proceedings have made it difficult either to shelve or to postpone,—that of Parliamentary Reform. Now we think that it would not be difficult to draw out a Reform Bill—very different indeed from the crude and wretched proposition introduced by Lord John Russell at the beginning of

the session—which such a ministry as we have suggested might unanimously adopt,—which it would be wise for them to bring forward and easy for them to carry,—which would command the support of the Liberals as an undeniable improvement on the present system, and which might reasonably look for the consent of the Tories, both on the ground of its intrinsic merits, and as far preferable to what they must be prepared to submit to, if the Whigs should again regain ascendancy, and find it desirable to bid high for radical support. There are many points in the actual arrangement both of the franchise and the representation which are felt by *all* parties as evils which ought to be removed, and anomalies which cannot be defended—there are practical improvements in the electoral system, which have never been made party questions, and have scarcely even been brought before the public, but which, as soon as suggested, would be recognised by every one as most valuable and salutary; and there are modes of *extending* the franchise without *lowering* it, which, when once proposed, would be felt to be at all events safe and serviceable approaches to the solution of one of the most perplexing problems which beset the friends of a reform in the great vital organ of the State. A bill embodying these amendments, which

Sir James Graham and Mr. Gladstone might honourably, and without compromise, join in proposing, which Lord John Russell and Mr. Cobden could not help supporting, (though it might be under protest as not going far enough,) and which Lord Derby could scarcely find any decent pretext for opposing, would, we believe, be at once a great source of strength and popularity to the administration, and a substantial and permanent blessing to the country.

Such, in brief, are our notions as to the political wants of the nation, and the best means of supplying them. The new Parliament will show what are the chances of seeing our hopes fulfilled. We have left ourselves no space to speak of the books placed at the head of this Article. That of Mr. Moseley contains much good sense, many sound views, many useful suggestions; but it is sadly languid and wordy, and the style is loose, rambling, and inelegant. The work of Mr. Cornwall Lewis is of a far higher order and has a different scope. It is scientific in its object and arrangement, and is full of solid thought and extensive learning. But it would be doing it great injustice to treat of it at the far-end of a paper on practical policy.

NOTE BY THE AMERICAN PUBLISHERS.

WE have to apologise to our subscribers for the inferior quality of the paper upon which this number is printed. The long continued drought of the past summer, has made it impossible for our paper manufacturers to fulfil their contracts; and necessity has driven us to make use of such paper as we could get. We have, however, made arrangements for the future, which will effectually prevent the recurrence of a like difficulty.

L. S. & Co.

INDEX TO VOL. XVII.

A

ALBERT, PRINCE, his Industrial College of Arts and Manufactures. See Industrial College.

Alfred, King, 78—the two great elements of our race, *ib.*—original condition of mankind one of culture, *ib.*—difference between a rude and a savage people, 79—youth of Alfred—journey to Rome, 80—his mysterious disease, 82—his relations with the Church, 83—his first interview with Asser, monk of St. David's, 84—character of his literary works, 85—his political institutions, 86—his Protestantism, 87—merits of Dr. Pauli's book—character of the Rev. J. A. Giles' "Life of Alfred, 87, 88.

American poetry, 212—its general character, *ib.*—Longfellow, 213—Bryant, 219—Thomas Buchanan Read, 220—Edgar Poe, 222—mediocrity of American poets, 224—recommendations, 224–226.

Anglo-Catholics found their tenets upon the Liturgy, 203.

Aquilonius on binocular vision, 91, note.

Archæology. See Primeval.

Asser, monk of St. David's, his connexion with King Alfred, 84.

Auchterarder case, statement of, 136.

Australia, Ornithology of, 180.

B

Balmes, Rev. J., leader of a new intellectual school in Spain, 57—aims at the internal revival and restoration of the Spanish Church, *ib.*—his work on civilisation reviewed, *ib.*

Baptismal regeneration, 207—no trace of infant baptism in the New Testament, 209.

Binocular vision and the stereoscope, 88—inventions have their infancy and manhood, 89—Leonardo da Vinci's observations, 90—each eye sees dissimilar pictures of solids, *ib.*—Mr. Wheatstone's theory of the stereoscope erroneous, 92, 93—Sir David Brewster's law of visible direction, 93—history of his lenticular stereoscope, 94—his theory of the stereoscope, 95—method of taking accurate binocular pictures, 96—why the perspective of a picture is best seen with one eye, 98—influence of size in lenses, *ib.*—monocular and binocular portraits incorrect, *ib.*—method of uniting the two, 99—superiority of the lenticular stereoscope, 100—use of the stereoscope to painters and sculptors, 101—photographical pictures combined by the stereoscope, 101, 102—effects of the union of similar pictures, 103—illusions resulting from this union, 104—conversion of relief, cameos and intaglios, 105, 106—inversion of form, single and binocular cameoscopes, 107—chromatic stereoscope, relief from colour, 108—binocular perspective, theory of a picture, 108, 109.

Brain, its relation to the mind, 24.

Brewster, Sir David, account of his stereoscopes, 94.

British statesmanship and policy, prospects of, 1—requirements and dangers of the day, 2—list of potential statesmen, 3—materials for future cabi-

nets, 4–6—administrators wanted rather than legislators, 7—real irresponsibility of ministers, *ib.*—cause of the scanty supply of public men, 9—character of middle-class representatives, 10—undesirableness of parliamentary life, 10, 11—administrative genius and dialectic skill seldom meet in one mind, 12—bounded sympathies of London senators, 13—union of the two functions of the Lord Chancellor, *ib.*—remedy for existing evils, 17—need of *ex officio* seats, 18—suggestion as to unrecognised statesmen, 19—Henry Taylor's opinion, 20—temper of Mr. Roebuck's work, 21.

Burns, Robert, his interview with Walter Scott, 153—Francis Jeffrey attracted by the sight of him on the High Street of Edinburgh, 154.

Bryant, W. C., review of his "Thanatopsis," 219.

C

Cabinets, materials for future, 4–6.

Calamus, its origin and use in the Church, 61.

Cameoscopes, single and binocular, 107.

Carlyle's Latter Day Pamphlets reviewed, 1.

Chalmers, Dr., Memoirs of, 110—the man of an epoch, *ib.*—a great man, 111—distinguished for *momentum*, unity of intention, transparent simplicity, 111, 112—conflict between the man and the Christian, 112—conquest over the idolatry of self, 113—the secret of his power lies in the concentration of his faculties, and their subordination to the higher purposes of his life, 114—relative religious condition of England and Scotland in his time—moderatism, 115—religious revival and the Westminster Confession, 116—his evangelic mission, *ib.*—ordinary pulpit style, 117—his personal influence, 118, 119—influence in the professorial chair, 119, 120—preference of the chair to the pulpit, 120—impulse communicated to the ministerial mind of Scotland, 123—his function as a systematic philanthropist, 124, 125—his advocacy of establishments, 125—harmony between the principle of establishments and the principles resulting in the Disruption, 128–130—Dr. Chalmers's connexion with it misunderstood, 131—the Veto Law, 135—Non-intrusion controversy, 136—his part in the Disruption, 143.

Church of England, liturgical reform in, 144.

Church Establishments, Dr. Chalmers's advocacy of, 125—light thrown upon the question by the Disruption, 149.

Church of the middle ages, its effects on European society, 61.

Civilisation, progress of, under Popery and under Protestantism, 59.

Clarendon, Lord, qualifications as a statesman, 3.

Cockburn's "Life of Jeffrey" reviewed, 153.

Combe, George, review of his "Constitution of Man," 22.

D

Despotism, priestly, effects of, upon a nation, 67.

Disruption of the Scottish Establishment, 128—es-

sential differences between the Scotch and English Reformation and the established forms of worship, 129—absurd to subject the two to the same treatment, 130—increase of the evangelical party, 131—the outcry against patronage a necessary result, 132—the Call of the people, *ib.*—rendered a nullity, 133—different proposals for giving effect to it, 134—the Veto Law, 135—warmly commended by Lord Brougham, *ib.*—Non-intrusion controversy, 136—the Auchterarder case, *ib.*—the two parties in the Church, 137—the temper of statesmen, 138, 139—the preceding events, 141—the pleas of Government, 142—reason of the Disruption, *ib.*—English and Scotch Church principle, 144—the Headship, *ib.*—co-ordination practicable, 146—problems involved in the Disruption, 148—Church Establishments, 149—waste of religious organization, 150—fiscal economy of the Free Church, 150, 151.

E

Earle, Sullivan, review of his *Life of Gilbert Arnold*, 33.
Establishments, Religious, Chalmers's advocacy of, 125—in harmony with the principles which resulted in the Disruption, 128–130.
Exhibition of 1851, statistical details of, 287—its results, 289, 290.

F

France, industrial education in, 280—the first exhibiting nation in the Crystal Palace, 291, 292.

G

Giles, Rev. J. A., character of his *Life of King Alfred*, 87, 88.
Gladstone, Mr., his qualifications as a statesman, 3.
Gould, John, his “*Birds of Australia*” reviewed, 176.

H

Hall, James, notice of his paper on binocular perspective, 109.
Hanna, Dr., review of his *Memoirs of Dr. Chalmers*, 110.
Hensler, Madame, her *Life of Niebuhr*, 226.
Hexameters next to impossible in a language like ours, 214.
Holland, New, birds of, 180.

I

Industrial College of Arts and Manufactures proposed by Prince Albert, 278—neglect of industrial education in England, 279—Industrial institutions of France, 280—Account of the *Ecole Centrale des Arts*, 281—decline of English science, 285—resolution to establish a great Central College of Industry, 292—relation between abstract science and art, 291—views of Liebig and Humboldt, 296—Minister's pledge to develop industry, art, and science, 298.

J

Jeffrey, Cockburn's *Life of*, 153—merits of the biography, 160—his boyhood, 161—juvenile performances, *ib.*—“command of language,” 162—residence at Glasgow and Oxford, 163—political condition of Scotland, 163–165—Lord Melville the *Pharos* of Scotland, 164—Jeffrey attaches himself to the Scottish Whig party, 165—professional life, 165, 166—the *Edinburgh Review*, 166—his understanding of Scottish Whiggism, 167, 168—qualifi-

cations as a critic, 171—specimens, 172, 173—new era in British literature, 175.

L

Lenticular Stereoscope, account of its invention by Sir D. Brewster, 94—its superiority, 100.
Leonardo da Vinci on binocular vision, 90.
Life and Chemistry, 70—the Lord of science, 72—the chemical elements, *ib.*—chemistry of exorganic forms, 73—only analytical, not synthetical, 74—histological physiology, 75—the brain and the nervous system, 76—Swedenborgian physiology, *ib.*
Lewis, G. Cornewall, his work on the “*Method of observation and reasoning in politics*” reviewed, 298.
Liturgical reform in the Church of England, 199—unrivalled excellence and beauty of the liturgy, *ib.*—the cause of this, *ib.*—the Church of England a Church of compromise, and with this view the liturgy was framed, 200—Parliament averse to making changes on the liturgy, 201—an age of religious earnestness adverse to compromise, 202—the liturgy the bulwark of Anglo-Catholics, 203—the Athanasian creed, 205—no error of doctrine in the burial service, 205, 206—objection to the absolute in the service for the visitation of the sick, 206—the ordination service, 206, 207—the service for infant baptism, 207—Sacredotalism, *ib.*—fatal objection to the present baptismal service, 208—authority for infant baptism, 209, 210—the language of the Apostolic Church does not apply to infant baptism, 211—importance of exegesis, 212.
Longfellow, H. W., criticism of his poetry, 213.

M

Monastic Orders, services of, in multiplying books, and in redeeming Christian slaves, 63.
Moseley, Joseph, his “*Political Elements, or the progress of Modern Legislation*” reviewed, 298.

N

Niebuhr, *Life and Letters of*, 226—his boyhood, 227—intelligence and information, 228—master of twenty languages, 229—philology and history his favourite studies, *ib.*—first residence at Copenhagen, 231—his opinion of London and Edinburgh, 232, 233—his marriage, 233—his political life in Prussia, 234—Lectures on Roman History at Berlin, 235—his own opinion of the first volume of his history, 236—Niebuhr and Goethe's opinions of one another, *ib.*—second marriage and mission to Rome, 237—opinion of Rome and its inhabitants, 238—his son, opinions as to infant training, 238, 239—life and lectures at Bonn, 239, 240—illness and death, 241—impressions of his character, 241—his religion, 243—merits and defects as a historian, 245.

O

Ornithology, 176—pleasure derived from the study, 177—numerical amount of species, *ib.*—the condor of the Cordilleras the largest, 178—the *Tringa* the most widely extended, 179—the representative species, 180—birds of Australia, 180, 181—special features of Australian Ornithology, 182—the buzzard, 183—bower-birds, the parrot, 183, 184—the pigeon, 185—mound-building birds, 186—swimming birds, 187—pelicans and cormorants, 188—birds of Ireland, 189—migratory movements of birds, 189, 190—geographical distribution, 190—effect of industrial operations on birds, 191—eagles, 192—hawks and owls of Ireland, 193, 194

incessorial or perhaps perching birds, 194—thrushes and titmice, 196—the crow, the magpie, 196, 197.

P

Parliament, Mr. Carlyle's view of, 13.
Parliamentary life, undesirableness of, 10, 11.
Pauli, Dr. Reinhold, his biography of King Alfred reviewed, 78.

Periodical Literature, recent change in, 174.

Photography, benefit of the stereoscope in, 97.

Phrenology, its place and relations, 22—general view of Combe's "Constitution of Man," ib.—its relation to religion, 23—relations of the brain and the mind, 24—the pretension of phrenology to point out not only the *places where* but the *manner how* the brain and mind are connected, 25—new light thrown upon old and familiar doctrines by phrenological jargon, 27—organs as indications of character, 28—size and activity of the organ, ib.—phrenology and moral science, 29, 30—Mr. Combe's three sources of crime, 30—if man is the victim of his nature, punishment inadmissible, 31, 32—phrenology and religion, 33—spiritual beliefs, 35—Mr. Combe's key to the true theory of the divine government, 36—evils of our social system, ib.—chief fault of Mr. Combe's work, 37.

Playfair, Dr. Lyon, on the decline of science in England, 285—lecture on the results of the Exhibition, 291.

Poe, Edgar, criticism of his poetry, 222.

Political Parties, crisis of, 299—condition of our "political elements," ib.—fatal equivoque, 300—danger of a lax morality among public men, 301—303—Mr. Disraeli's recantation indefensible, 304—unworthy language of Lord Derby, 304—prolongation of the Whig party not desirable, 305—the real parties in England, 306—the Grand Desideratum, the Eclectic party, 308—its composition, 308, 309—its policy, 309, 310.

Portraiture and Sculpture, application of the stereoscope to, 101.

Primeval Archaeology of Britain, 246—importance of the science, ib.—estimate of Dr. Wilson's work, 246, 247—aims of the science, 248—the stone period, 249—its remote antiquity, 250—the bronze period, 251—the races of these periods, 253—the "stone" men Allophylans, 254—two Allophylan or ante-Celtic races, 256—bronze probably of Gaelic introduction, 257.

Protestant divisions indicative of freedom and intellectual activity, 70.

Protestantism and Romanism compared in their effects on civilisation, 59, 60.

R

Read, T. B., criticism of his poetry, 220.

Roebuck's "History of the Whig Administration of 1830" reviewed, 1.

Romanism, errors of, 257—Archbishop Whately's "Cautions for the Times," 259—specimens of successful refutation of Popish errors, ib.—the *new* and the *old* religion, ib.—private judgment, 260—worship of saints and the Virgin, ib.—transubstantiation, 261—Popery confirms the depraved tendencies of human nature, while Protestantism opposes them, 263—superstition, 264—extreme unction and purgatory, 265, 266—vicarious religion, 266—pious frauds, 267—infallibility, 268—origin of Romish errors, 269—persecution, 271, 272—self-righteousness, 272—views of the Reformers to the time of Bishop Bull, 273—Bishop O'Brien on justification, 275—Cardinal Bellarmine and Bishop Bull, 276—the true author of Popery, 278.

Romanism and European civilisation, 56—connexion

of the Roman Church with European progress, 58—the terms Catholic and Christian synonymous with Balmez, 59—the Church of the Empire, 60—the Church and the Barbarians, 62—emancipated the body but enchaind the soul, 64—the cup and calamus, ib.—civilizing effects of the two elements as manifested in Spain and Great Britain, 65—priestly despotism, 67—partial civilisations, 68—Protestant divisions, 70.

S

Sacerdotalism the prolific source of almost every corruption, 207.

Saxons, character of the, in the days of Alfred, 75.

Scotchmen, century of eminent, 154—their classification, 154, 155—*Scotticism* of Scotchmen, 155—peculiarity of Scottish as compared with English thought, 157—Scottish influence in philosophy, 158—in literature, 159—Scottish Whiggism, 167—Scottish criticism, 170.

Spain, effects of Popery on, 67.

Statesmen, survey of present and prospective British, 2, 3—qualifications required in, 12.

Stereoscope, its history, construction, and application, 89—superiority of the lenticular, 100.

Swedenborg's description of what poetical language should be, 225.

T

Taylor, Henry, his work entitled "The Statesman" reviewed, 1.

Thompson, William, review of his *Natural History of Ireland*, 176—short notice of his works, 176, 177, note.

Tractarian poison insidiously conveyed in stories for the young, 40.

V

Village life in England, 38—books for the poor, 39—Tractarian story-books, 40—Mr. Sullivan Earle's "Gilbert Arnold," 40, 41—"Companions of my Solitude," 41—Communication between rich and poor, ib.—duties of the English housewife, 42—antidote to the alehouse, 43—houses for the poor, 44—condition of the daughters of the poor, ib.—great sin of great cities, the source often lies in rural districts, ib.—seduction, 46—judicious treatment at the turning-point of the career, 47—employment of females, needlework, 49—evils in the management of village shops, 50—duty of the rich to employ their poorer neighbours, 51—the schoolmaster, 52—lending libraries, 53—savings club, ib.—remissness of the clergy, ib.—opportunities for good, 54, 55—claims of the poor and duties of the rich, 55, 56.

Voss, the poet, his connexion with Niebuhr, 228, 230—Niebuhr's opinion of his poetry, 231.

W

Whately, Archbishop, on the "Errors of Romanism"—see Romanism—defects of his work, 263.

Wheatstone, Charles, his theory of binocular vision, 59.

Whiggism, Scottish, 165—Jeffrey's theory of, 167, 168.

Wilkinson, J. J. G., review of his work on the Human Body and its connexion with Man, 70—a disciple of Swedenborg, 72.

Wilson, Daniel, LL.D., his work on Archaeology reviewed, 256.

Worsaae, J. J. A., his "Primeval Antiquities of Denmark" reviewed, 256.



THE

NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

NOVEMBER, 1852, AND FEBRUARY, 1853.

VOLUME XVIII.

AMERICAN EDITION, VOL. XIII.

NEW YORK:

PUBLISHED BY LEONARD SCOTT & CO.,

79 FULTON STREET, CORNER OF GOLD.

1853.



THE
NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

No. XXXV.

FOR NOVEMBER, 1852.

ART. I.—*Report of Her Majesty's Commissioners appointed to inquire into the State, Discipline, Studies, and Revenues of the University and Colleges of Oxford; together with the Evidence, and an Appendix.*
London, 1852.

Two years ago we reviewed the history, existing condition, and future prospects of the University of Oxford, on the occasion of the appointment of the Royal Commission of Inquiry. That Commission has now laid the result of its labours before Parliament and the public, in the shape of a Blue Book of more than 700 pages. The document appeared at a time of happy omen for the abolition of old things and the introduction of new. The late House of Commons was drawing its last legislative breath, while the arraigned University was witnessing the close of another academical year—an epoch which, like similar periods in that individual life which is regarded as so exact a parallel to the existence of corporations, may be charitably supposed to be sacred to self-examination and resolutions of amendment. National representatives *in posse*, and collegiate authorities *in esse* have alike had the opportunity of devoting a portion of their summer leisure to the study of a work which may be sport to the one or death to the other. Before these pages reach our readers one of the two bodies, if not both, will have met for the despatch of business—summoned by the inexorable requirements of University routine, or the more capricious dictates of Lord Derby's sense of decency. But whenever Parliament may assemble, the temporary pressure of political perplexities, no less than the invariable slowness of Oxford movements, is a sufficient guarantee to us that nothing will have

been done by either to supersede any comments which we may venture to offer on the aspect of the question as viewed from within or from without.

Though the proceedings of judicial Westminster and dependent Oxford are still *in dubio*, there is, we believe, no doubt that the Report has been well received. Even the more advanced section of the Liberal press has spoken of it as forming a favourable exception to the vacillation and feebleness of most of our parliamentary literature—even the prejudice of High Church journalism admits that it is able and well-considered, and acquits it of the charge of one-sidedness in dealing with the evidence given. It is of course not to be expected that the microscopic gaze of the elder Conservative residents should not have discovered some flaws intellectual as well as moral, in a document affecting their interests, yet not emanating from themselves in whole or in part. Nor can we wonder that the publication should provoke the unfriendly criticism of one or two doubtful Reformers who are disappointed not to have been able to influence the direction of the inquiry. But on the whole, both friends and foes seem agreed that it is a work of high character and great importance, to be carefully weighed, not summarily dismissed. We should have been surprised if the most casual reader had come to any other conclusion. At the first glance it is evident that the Commissioners have a thorough acquaintance with their subject, both in its history and in its philosophy; that while they know, as Oxford men, what is now going on in Oxford, and as historical students, what has been found possible there in former times, they are not blind to those less limited visions which represent an ideal but seldom contemplated by English minds

—the University of the Future. But it is not to the authors of the Report alone that the public has to render its acknowledgments. One half at least of the bulky folio is occupied with the evidence of other members of the University; and the proportion holds good no less morally than materially. More than fifty gentlemen of academical station and recognised ability have come forward to state their views on a number of questions, indicated by the Commissioners as those on which it was most important that the general sense of men of enlightenment should be ascertained; and there is besides much direct testimony to special facts by persons officially qualified to speak, such as professors and tutors of colleges. The result is, that the country has been presented with a collection, as complete as could have been made under the circumstances, of pamphlets on University matters by the best authors, especially addressed to readers of the year 1852. These, as might be supposed, are in many cases distinguished by striking ability, and that not always in direct proportion to the reputation enjoyed by the various writers in the world without; so that the further advantage is gained of familiarizing people with the names of men who have hitherto deserved rather than attained notoriety. The past experience of the Archbishop of Dublin, though unfolded with characteristic acuteness, shows less of comprehensive observation and mature reflection than the present impressions of Mr. Jowett. Or to take an instance of men, both of whom have long been absent from the University, Mr. Wilkinson, the unknown Rector of Broughton Gifford, Wilts, has meditated on the condition of his Alma Mater with much more profit than Mr. Herman Merivale, late Professor of Political Economy, and Under Secretary for the Colonies. It is pleasanter, however, to award praise directly than to leave it to be inferred from invidious comparisons. Professor Vaughan's academical celebrity did not require any additional support; but we would thank him most warmly for the profound thought, austere enthusiasm, and lofty eloquence, which would commend his evidence to general attention, even if regarded merely as a piece of composition. The rare judgment and practical power shown in Mr. Temple's elaborate and systematic exposition will satisfy the public that it is fortunate in having secured the services of such a man as Principal of the Training College at Kneller Hall. Those whose attention has been attracted to the unfortunate disputes at Lincoln College, recently made matter of publicity, will now see how greatly the intel-

lectual character of the Society might have been benefited by the elevation of Mr. Pattison to the Rectorship. Mr. Wall's answers will enable practical men out of Oxford to judge of the ability and zeal which are making Balliol College as pre-eminent economically as it has long been intellectually and socially. Nor ought we to forget the brief but decisive statement in which Mr. Lowe, the new member for Kidderminster, disposes of certain educational fallacies which yet haunt the mind of the University. There is beside a considerable variety of dissertations on special points. Mr. Denison contributes some valuable remarks on the propriety and possibility of fostering the study of law in Oxford, and Dr. Acland does the same for medicine. Mr. Neate, on the other hand, brings his legal knowledge to bear on the questions of the permanent obligation of founders' wills, and the management of College property; while the indefatigable Mr. Wilkinson adds a postscript on the visitatorial power of the Crown over the University, which proves that he might have made an excellent lawyer himself. But it is the merit of the whole collection, rather than that of its several parts, which constitutes, in our view, its chief claim to attention. As we turn over its pages, we feel that one thing at least is demonstrated indisputably—that the principles and objects, as well as the multifarious details, of University education, are in the main thoroughly understood by Oxford men in the nineteenth century. Educators, reclusé students, and men of the world, have combined to produce a work which England can present to Paris or Heidelberg, in the confidence that it will be received with respect, even by those whose superiority in some essential points it frankly acknowledges. We feel that if the Academical citadel be susceptible of defence against the anti-educational influences of the day, there is no lack of hands to defend it. Nay, we doubt whether Oxford conservatism could vindicate itself better than by pointing to this very Blue Book, and insisting on the fact that the old system has been found capable of producing so much intellect, knowledge, and energy, as are now engaged in pleading for its reformation.

In passing on to a closer examination of the Report, we shall not be required to bestow an equal share of notice on every part of it. Much space is naturally devoted to a historical account of the University and the Colleges, which we can safely recommend to our readers as sufficiently clear, vigorous, and complete. To enter upon this, however, would be only to repeat a considerable

part of our former Article, as the general results aimed at by the Commissioners, are, we are happy to say, the same as our own, and our limits will not allow us to lose any time in the by-ways of antiquarian detail. Neither will it be necessary to reiterate any of the conclusions which appeared to follow as practical corollaries from our view of the past, to prove again that the Universities are national, and that College property is not private property. It is a satisfaction to have a regular legal statement like Mr. Dampier's on the subject of collegiate trusts, as an answer to those who prefer the letter to the spirit of the constitution; but little good would be done by attempting an analysis of it for the benefit of persons already convinced that proved abuses are their own condemnation. We purpose, then, at once to dismiss all that has reference to the principle of the inquiry, both as having already received such consideration as it was in our power to give, and as being virtually settled by the institution of an inquiry at all, and so to occupy ourselves with the only part which can in our judgment be fairly made a matter of debate in or out of Parliament, the superstructure of practical suggestions resting on the admitted hypothesis of University and Collegiate reform.

The first recommendation of the Commissioners, as might be surmised, is, that the University be relieved from the chains in which, two hundred years ago, it was bound hand and foot by the serpent wisdom of Laud. What is the precise extent of its present bondage is indeed not absolutely clear. In 1759, the Heads of Houses were desirous of altering one of the Laudian statutes, and found no difficulty in getting lawyers to assure them that no act of the University could possibly have deprived it of a privilege once belonging to it. But the eminent counsel of 1759, like the eminent counsel of 1851, failed to remove the scruples of men who asserted that the opinion, however consolatory in the abstract, did not meet the precise facts of the case. At any rate, a directly contrary opinion was given in 1836 by Lord (then Sir John) Campbell, and Dr. Lushington, who declared that in depriving Dr. Hampden of the rights secured to the Regius Professor of Divinity by the Laudian Code, the University had, in the eye of the law, forfeited its charter. The practice of the University, it appears, has been a singular attempt at compromise, analogous to the policy which the Colleges have observed with regard to their own statutes. Three

of the Laudian statutes have been detached from the rest and treated as inviolable, while the others have been explained, dispensed with, and even abrogated at pleasure—a distinction for which the Commissioners profess themselves unable to discover any authority. Under these circumstances they suggest that steps should be taken to ascertain the legal position of the University, and that, if necessary, indemnity should be granted for the past and liberty for the future. If there be any prudence in the academical mind, we do not see how this suggestion can be regarded as otherwise than well-timed. The best course for Oxford in general may be to remain quiet and avoid public notice; but it must surely be more advisable to accept an obligation from the English Parliament than to run the risk of a crushing collision with the English Law.

This antecedent disability removed, the thing which comes first under question is the academical constitution itself. Of the three insurmountable statutes that which establishes the government of the University of course is one. Unchanged itself, the Hebdomadal Board has been the arbiter of all change—of the many corruptions which the lapse of two centuries and the decay of learning and enthusiasm have introduced, and of the few remedies which have been applied to meet the disease. And now at last, when it is put on its trial before the University which it has governed so long, its condemnation is all but unanimous. The one exception proves the rule most unmistakably. "It is, however," the Commissioners gravely say, "that of an eminent man who is himself a member of the governing body," a sentence adroitly worded, so as to leave it doubtful whether the meaning is that an eminent man is more or less entitled to a hearing on account of the position which has at once given him a personal knowledge of the system and a personal interest in maintaining it. Doubtless, however, all the other Heads of Houses, if they could or would speak, would assure the world that the University has no chance of getting on without them. The ominous silence of Dr. Macbride, the only other member of the Board who has found a tongue, may be owing to unexpressed reforming predilections, but it may also be set down to the good taste of his conservatism. But whatever may be the feelings of the shepherds, the voice of the sheep is sonorous and unequivocal. It has had its effect on the Commissioners, one of whom, it must not be forgotten, is, like Dr. Cardwell, "an eminent man, who is himself a member of the governing body." We do not find that Dr. Jeune absented him-

self from the meetings of the Commission during this part of their deliberations, as was done by one of his colleagues, on a subsequent occasion, to avoid the operation of personal bias; so full credit ought to be given for the value of his adhesion. When we read (Report, pp. 11, 12) that "it is anomalous that the government of this great institution should be committed to persons, the great majority of whom are elected by the fellows of the separate colleges out of their own narrow circle, often for reasons of a personal or social nature, and with little or no regard to the welfare of the University," and, "more anomalous still, that the literary interests of the University should be committed to persons who are not necessarily chosen for literary qualifications," it is important to recollect that these are words in which the instinctive sentiment of the unprivileged many is ratified by the deliberate judgment of one of the privileged few.

After this unprecedented concurrence of opinion, sanctioned by authority so unimpeachable, we may be spared the necessity of arguing against the Hebdomadal Board. It constitutes, in fact, the climax of the great corruption of Oxford, the superseding of the University by the Colleges, though the advocates of the collegiate system are second to none in their expressions of hostility to this last development of the usurpation which they so strenuously abet. But while the evil is palpable, the cure, as the Commissioners themselves feel, is not so clear. Wisely, in our opinion, they reject the simplest of the expedients proposed—that of "investing Convocation with the right of debating and amending all propositions submitted to its vote." So far from it, they would abridge the powers already possessed by that unruly and unenlightened body. We have since been told that "the shutting up of the great council" imperils "the heritage of Alfred and de Montfort:" but these magniloquent antiquarianisms fail to convince us of the desirableness of encumbering the academical legislature with a large body of persons in most cases originally incompetent, and further disqualified by lengthened absence from the place which is to be affected by their legislation. The Universities, as things now stand, are far too liberal in conferring a degree which ought to be a certificate of real merit; but as it is the country which is mainly in fault, so it is the country which mainly suffers by the lowering of the standard. But the disgrace becomes flagrant and cruel injustice when this indiscriminate assemblage of graduates is summoned to Oxford to neutralize and overwhelm the *bona fide* votes of distinguished

men actively employed on the spot—to throw out a statute which nine-tenths of them would be puzzled to explain, or to degrade a theologian for an elaborate work known to them only by a few garbled extracts, and even those imperfectly apprehended. It is not a question of universal suffrage, of the Braintree rabble *versus* Major Beresford, strange as it would be that the Tory University should set so high a value on the popular voice. The masses of England are directly interested in the leading questions of English politics; they are alive to the imposition of taxes, and naturally anxious about their appropriation. But the masses of Oxford cannot be said to be concerned in a system with the working of which they have nothing whatever to do, and to the support of which, in spite of their slender yearly payments, they will not venture to pretend that they contribute anything. As members of the nation, they may justly claim to exercise a certain general control over the seats of national education; but that is already secured to them in Parliament and in public opinion. The cause of Convocation is not the cause of academical self-government, but the reverse—the cause of interference from without, and that not by a qualified functionary, but by a miscellaneous multitude—a thing to which the worst democracies, so far as we know, supply no parallel. Nothing, we fear, short of a *coup d'état* could sweep it away altogether: but we hail with delight any measure which tends to counteract its injurious efficiency. However, the only alternative is not between this reactionary ochlocracy and the "stable oligarchy of the Hebdomadal Board." It has been proposed to regenerate the Board itself either by enlargement or by diminution—by infusing new blood, or by lopping off useless limbs. But the Commissioners feel, and we think with justice, that neither plan would answer the desired end—the one as involving the evil of frequent elections, as the additions made would naturally consist of a selection from the tutors and professors; the other as making an invidious and possibly inefficacious distinction, while it would leave the grievances of the unrepresented residents wholly unredressed. Accordingly they suggest a *tertium quid* in the shape of a restoration of Congregation, the assembly of regents, which, as we explained formerly, was once a living reality, and is now an existing nullity. As regency now implies not teaching but simply juniority of standing, this body of course has to undergo reconstitution as well as emancipation. It is suggested that it should consist of the heads of houses and proctors, the professors and public lec-

turers, (a class which, as we shall see, the Report proposes considerably to increase,) and the senior tutor of each College. This assembly is to meet not regularly but by special summons, on the requisition of the heads, or of a certain number of its own members, and to deliberate in English on such matters as fall within the province of the University. The Hebdomadal Board is to remain, independently of its position in Congregation, for the purpose apparently of transacting administrative business, and of exercising the initiative just mentioned. Convocation, too, is to remain, in its present condition of a Lower House, receiving and (if it pleases) rejecting but not discussing bills, and electing the chancellor and the burgesses, though not the professors. This clemency, as we have said, we are inclined to grudge: nor do we sympathize with that which continues to the Hebdomadal Board an abbreviated authority. It is true that heads of Colleges, if deprived of their university functions, would find a large part of their occupation gone, and their offices would in consequence fall considerably as objects of ambition; but this cannot be helped, if indeed it would not be a positive advantage. The influence which the Commissioners would leave them is somewhat indeterminate; but we see no medium between an oppressive fact and an unmeaning fiction. We think, too, there is some academical pedantry in the notion of formally reviving an institution which has been a *caput mortuum* since the Reformation, as if it were absolutely necessary to shew a historical precedent for a change clearly good in itself, as if such precedents, when not followed literally, but strained to admit large modifications, could really be said to retain any appreciable historical value. Prudence, indeed, may sanction such nominal revivals, as concessions to scrupulous lawyers or timid Conservatives; but, on the other hand, they have a fatal tendency to encourage, what in Oxford needs no encouragement, that distrust of new remedies which, as Bacon remarks, is the surest way of incurring new diseases. Still, it is well to be thankful for what we can get; so we will not quarrel with the boon of Congregation either for its name or for its concomitants, but accept it in the hope that the old form may prove a new power, strong enough to control the two most uncongenial elements which are still suffered to co-exist with it.

The discipline of the University is the natural pendant to its administration. This question, as treated by the Commissioners, is a very wide one, embracing not only the condition of the present race of students,

and the means of acting on them, but the whole subject of University Extension. The former part of it, however, though infinitely difficult to grapple with in practice, necessarily shrinks to a more moderate compass on paper. The more obvious kinds of mechanical restraint are already in force. The proctors preserve external decency, and cut off a certain proportion of facilities for temptation. The collegiate system, if good for nothing else, succeeds in securing to a small extent the personal supervision which is realized by boarding houses at schools. Hence with regard to two out of the three evils especially noted, sensual vice, gambling, and extravagance, the Commissioners have little to offer beyond a stereotyped exhortation to greater vigilance, which is tantamount to saying that no great diminution of their present amount is to be expected. The first of them, indeed, is merely a single aspect of an enormous social problem which, though daily becoming more and more urgent, scarcely any one ventures to approach: still we think that, without any breach of delicacy, it might have been spoken of more fully both in the Report and in the Evidence, if it were only to shew that the Commissioners, and others interested in education, had reflected on the subject, and felt its difficulty. But about extravagance there is a good deal more to be said. The respectable public has of late years become awake to the fact, that to have a son hampered with college debts is exceedingly inconvenient, and it not unnaturally asks, Why cannot University and College authorities stop it? In deference to this cry, the Commissioners enter at considerable length into a question which, as it seems to us, they do not themselves regard as a very profitable one. They even venture to suggest that the Legislature might do something by enacting, that no debt shall be recoverable from a minor *in statu pupillari*, unless the bills shall have been sent in within a certain time to the pupil, and, if necessary, to his tutor. Another of their remedies, though classed by them as indirect, strikes us as much more to the purpose—the summary removal of idle and extravagant students. But then comes the pinch, Would the respectable public support the authorities in taking such stringent measures? in other words, Would it be wise enough to see that the less promising part of the rising generation must be sacrificed to save the rest? We fear not. “Ces pères de famille sont capables de tout:” and though ready enough to speak of their grievances as a class, they feel and act as individuals. Some would talk of cruelty and injustice, others of ill-judged and im-

pertinent interference. And if the result were, as it probably would be, a visible diminution of numbers even in the most flourishing Colleges, would principals and vice-principals have the strength of mind to perceive that this failure was probably temporary, to be followed by a return of public confidence equal in quantity and increased in quality a hundred fold, and that in any case their duty to the youth of England is to be performed not by lowering themselves to its standard, but by raising it to theirs? We suspect that the Committee of Heads of Houses in 1846, in declaring that little would be done by direct interference, was not sorry to discourage an activity which might lead to unpleasant consequences. "*Malumus regnum vastatum esse quam damnatum*," is a hard saying—perhaps more than can be expected from any whose convictions are not of equal strength with the bigotry that originally uttered it. Yet Arnold was found to declare, that while it was not necessary that Rugby should be a school of 300, or 100, or 50 boys, it was necessary that it should be a school of Christian gentlemen; and it would be humiliating to think that such sentiments were utterly unknown to the officials of his own University. Certainly no better answer could be given to the complaints of parents than the announcement of a resolution to purify the College atmosphere till it could be safely breathed by the weak and inexperienced. The onus would then be thrown on society, which would have to bear it as it best might. Meantime there is one recommendation of the Commissioners, which, supported as it is by the great bulk of the evidence, will, we trust, encounter but little opposition—the abolition of all academical distinctions of rank and wealth. After ages will hardly credit, that up to 1852, Oxford so far encouraged some of the worst tendencies of the English character, as to accept extra fees from as many of its students as thought it worth their while to go to the expense, and grant them in return a measure of exemption from that moral and intellectual discipline which, on general grounds, she declared to be essential.

On the subject of University extension our own opinions have already been expressed too fully to need repetition. It must be confessed, however, that both the Report of the Commissioners and the great body of the evidence are decidedly against us. When we are despondent they are sanguine. We do not wish to underrate the importance of such an accumulated weight of testimony. But we should have thought more highly of it if it had obviously been

given after a deliberate consideration of the arguments that present themselves on the other side. We never disguised from ourselves that on this point we were dissenters from the catholic faith of University reformers; we only felt that we had protestant reasons to render for our dissidence. Thus, when we find that neither the Commissioners nor the mass of their supporters appear to have been insensible of the difficulties which struck us as not only grave but insuperable, we can hardly think our position altered from what it was in November 1850. Mr. Clough, late Fellow and Tutor of Oriel College, and afterwards Principal of the new Hall in connexion with the London University, is the only one whose adhesion to the orthodox belief seems to be based on a full consciousness that there are two sides to the question. But against his testimony we may set off that of Mr. Mansel, Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, whose views as nearly as possible coincide with those hazarded by ourselves. No allusion is made to this part of his evidence in the Report: while Mr. Clough, though quoted at length, as having "well argued the whole question," is appealed to, not in answer to objections actual or possible, but simply in confirmation of a sentiment assumed to be universally prevalent. We will give such extracts from the arguments of both these gentlemen as may enable our readers to judge of them positively as well as comparatively.

After stating the presumption which the increase of commercialism affords against the success of any attempt to extend the University, Mr. Clough proceeds,—

"Though there certainly is a good deal of reluctance to allow much time for education before business, yet it seems to be true that the opposite feeling gains ground. If fathers are on one side, mothers are on the other. It is not uncommon for a merchant to send his son abroad, after leaving school, for a year's experience of the world. The apprenticeship both for solicitors and merchants, it is said, might be abridged with advantage. Indefinite fears of extravagant and dissipated courses, the notion of unfit habits and ideas and useless studies and tastes, would undoubtedly operate long enough to make the change extremely gradual. But if those fears are, as I believe them to be, exaggerated, and that notion only half true, experience would surely, however gradually, lessen the former and modify the latter. The sphere which already includes the London banker would presently be extended over other commercial classes. More and more young men, sons of the more affluent parents, destined for business, would be brought under the influence of the ancient rational education. There would perhaps be a pressure for earlier

admission than is now usual. Yet the data of University or King's College, London, must not be overstrained. They prove, perhaps, that classical and mathematical instruction, even when modified for modern views, is not a sufficient attraction. But Oxford and Cambridge have others. On the whole, I venture to conclude that there are a great many young men who ought to come to the old Universities, and who would come. What keeps them away is, I believe, rather the want of confidence than the actual amount of expense. Single colleges, I am told, in which confidence is felt, are applied to by numbers, who, if refused admission there, do not come to the University at all. I would suggest to Her Majesty's Commissioners the analogy of the public schools. Twenty years ago somewhat of a similar feeling prevailed respecting them. May not the next twenty years as greatly extend the University system as the last have the public schools? I do not at all say that these as they now are perfect, but they are extensively useful; and any change which experience shall prove to be needed will not knock at those doors altogether hopelessly. The vessel is in motion, and its course may be guided. And certainly, if I may judge by personal recollections of the conduct of that change, during what may be called its eight first years, under the most vigorous and effective of the reconstructing hands, a good deal of unfearing experimentation may and should in such cases be hazarded."—*Evidence*, pp. 212, 213, quoted in *Report*, p. 97.

On the other hand, Mr. Mansel says,—

"I do not think that any great scheme of University extension is practicable in the present day. The whole current of society appears to be setting in an opposite direction. In an age of great competition of all trades and professions, few parents will send a son to spend three years at the University in the general enlargement of his mind, when he might be concentrating his faculties in his own business in the office, the counting-house, or the surgery. It gives his competitors too great a start in the race of life. Nor would this be in any great degree obviated by making University education more professional. The University must undertake to supply all the technical details of each special apprenticeship, or she will be unable to compete with any as a training-school for money-making. Such a teaching of technicalities is not desirable, and, what is more to the purpose, it is not practicable: the working part of every business will be best learned on the spot where it is exercised. Even as regards theoretical study, I believe that the minute cultivation of special departments of knowledge is as incompatible with the local grouping of all on the same spot, as with the possession of universal information by a single mind. A study, to be cultivated with real zeal, must be the study of the place. Each separate branch tends in its progress to acquire, not merely its own special devotees, but its own special locality. If the whole tendency of the age is to education as the means of earning a living, if, relatively to that purpose, practical experience is everything, and if centralization of all branches

of knowledge is not the best means of gaining practical experience in one only, general University extension is in this respect a backward, not a forward step. . . . The Church is about the only profession to which the above remarks do not apply; partly because clerical duties are not, like those of other professions, a direct means of pecuniary competition, and partly because the canonical period fixed for ordination prevents the struggle for an early start in the race of life. And it must be allowed that the tendency of late years has been to make the Universities, in an educational point of view, chiefly a training-school for clergymen, or for men of fortune who need no profession. In this respect the amount of University extension will be in a great degree regulated by the relations of supply and demand for labour in one particular department. And this has always appeared to me to be the weak point in the demand so frequently heard of late of very cheap education for very poor men. The question is frequently argued as if the B.A. degree were the end of a man's natural, as it generally is of his academical, life. Were this the case it might be a worthy object of every exertion to secure for him such a glorious euthanasia. But the further question remains, what can you do with your man when you have educated him? Is it really a charity to fit him for one walk only in life, to give him much general cultivation of mind, but little special means of bread-making; to turn him out too poor to associate with his equals in culture, too cultivated to associate with his equals in purse? Will Church extension meet the supply? and are very poor curates the most desirable or the only practicable means of Church extension? or is it expedient or practicable to introduce, as is largely the case in Germany, a body of family tutorships as a provision for poor scholars; in other words, to combine on a large scale the education of a gentleman with the condition of a servant? And will not the victim occasionally wish that dignity had been sacrificed to comfort, and that he had been sent behind the counter?"—*Evidence*, pp. 19, 20.

In one respect Mr. Clough's opinion is the more valuable of the two, as being presumably the result of a more extensive experience, the judgment of one who knows London as well as Oxford. We suspect, however, that distance lends enchantment to his view of the prospects of his original Alma Mater. Against the fact of an undeniable tendency he has little to offer beyond surmises and possibilities. The analogy of the public schools, to which he appeals, will not carry him very far. Their history during the last twenty years proves that it is possible to introduce with success considerable changes into an old established system of instruction, supposing external circumstances to be favourable. But this supposition is precisely what in the case of the Universities we are not entitled to make. There was nothing to prevent a reform in the public schools but the feelings of those who were

attached to the *status quo*. If the reactionary process has already commenced, as we grieve to think that it has, in the very head-quarters of improvement,—Arnold's own school of Rugby,—that is owing not to any irresistible obstacles existing in the nature of things, but simply and solely to a change of dynasty, such as may be brought about any day by a body of conservative trustees. Boys intended for business could be sent to public schools so soon as their parents became convinced that the instruction to be got there would be useful and not merely ornamental. Some might remain at school during the whole of the usual time, and others could be withdrawn earlier, whenever an opening for them could be found elsewhere. But it does not follow, that because our future merchants and manufacturers can be spared from the counting-house or the factory till the age of sixteen, or even nineteen, they are to be tempted by any amount of educational or economical reform to defer their entry into life to their twenty-second or twenty-third year. On the contrary, it is obvious that where the demands of a school are complied with reluctantly, those of a University are sure to be refused altogether. The fact is, that, as Mr. Griffiths remarks, (*Evidence*, p. 202,) our public schools have taken the place and do the work of what our Universities were in former times, so that an argument from the success of the one to that of the other is not only inconsequent but absolutely suicidal. The instance of the London bankers only proves that men whose fortunes are assured can afford to exempt their sons, to a certain extent, from that competition to which the less favoured have to submit. But those are surely exceptional cases in which a man of business can hope to hold his own by mere hereditary right, like a landowner or a member of a Whig cabinet. Since our last article appeared Mr. Cobden has told the people of Manchester what sort of education it is that the nature and opportunities of manufacturing life will allow. Standard works are to give place to periodicals, Thucydides to the *Times*. Can our rulers believe that if *he* could have been got to furnish evidence to the Commissioners, his estimate of the literary leisure of the younger portion of his order would have agreed with Mr. Clough's?

But although we think with Mr. Mansel that the vision of an extended University belongs rather to the irrevocable past than to the possible future, we cordially concur in the remedial measures suggested in the report. New halls, private lodgings, connected with or independent of colleges, and admission of strangers to professorial lec-

tures, are improvements which will suit Oxford as it is, no less than Oxford as it will be. The College monopoly, as the Commissioners appear to see, is an evil in any case, productive of useless expense, without any counterbalancing advantage: and its destruction is a simple matter of justice to those classes of society already within the academical pale, as well as to those, be they many or few, who are deterred from entering solely by the expense of the academical course. It may be said, indeed, that should no large extension take place, the accommodation already supplied will be amply sufficient; but we can hardly be expected to listen to reasoning which virtually contends that students are to be forced to reside within College walls merely because College walls have been erected for their reception. Any suggestion for the improvement of the University is surely entitled to a hearing on its own merits, subject to no reservation of the rights of empty buildings or their unprotected proprietors. Let us say then that we admire the magnanimity with which the Commissioners recommend that a fair trial should be given to all of the four plans already referred to, simply on account of the evidence with which each is supported, though themselves doubting the feasibility of one or two of the number. It is only by such a spirit of liberal concession that the cause of reform can possibly be advanced in these days, when the dissatisfaction of years has to find expression in a moment, and every sufferer draws on his own experience for a universal remedy. Oxford is now in the position of Germany in 1848; no Parliamentary Government has taught it the measure of political practicability; its soundest and best thinkers have never felt that they could secure the carrying of even the most common-sense proposition by the strength of ordinary combination, much less by the mere force of reason: and the only thing to be wondered at is, that a manifesto representing so great a variety of floating opinion should contain so little individual crotchet. In the present instance, we think the simultaneous developement of rival schemes may prove to be not only necessary, but positively beneficial. Even where they encroach on each other's sphere, the public may reap advantage from the competition. Existing side by side, they may tend to neutralize each other's defects.

We have no great affection for the project of a hall for poor students, as we believe that the line of demarkation thus introduced would be equally injurious to the poor and the rich, impressing the former with a daily sense of social inferiority, and confirming

the latter in any habits of indolence or insolence which they may have formed already. But the evil would be mitigated if the cheap hall were to present itself as one out of many means of avoiding expense, so that the choice might not lie between avarian frugality and collegiate extravagance. On other grounds nothing, as we conceive, can be said against restoring to the academical body the liberty of opening fresh halls. The enactment which took away the right seems to have been passed for the benefit of the Chancellor, whose power it helped to consolidate; but the purposes which it has really secured have been those of the College oligarchy. The question as it stands now is in effect that of the voluntary system against an effete establishment. The same cause which engages the interests of inferior men in support of the existing monopoly makes really able and energetic persons anxious for its abolition. They would far rather trust to their own powers of attracting students than to the prestige of an institution which, whatever its endowments, must always seem to them more or less hampered and paralyzed. The complaint indeed may be met in a much more obvious way by a reform of the Colleges themselves, such as, we shall see, the Commissioners proceed to propose. But though it would have been absurd for them, in their position, with an unlimited power of suggestion, to attempt to compass their object otherwise than directly, it is but common prudence in us to remind our readers that changes are seldom effected wholesale, and that a large portion of a reformer's work will generally be in the counteraction rather than in the removal of evils. As for affiliated halls, supplementary to the several Colleges, it is hardly worth while to waste a word in their defence. As the Commissioners remark, they would be mere extensions of the parent societies, so that no objection on the ground of principle can possibly apply to them. Difficulties of detail, such as want of funds, and want of building ground, are palpably matters of consideration for the Colleges which are ambitious of so extending themselves. It might be a question whether they should be obliged to found halls; but nothing can be said against repealing any statute which forbids them to do so. The real obstacle which would probably prevent the reception of such a proposal by the present governors of Oxford, the jealousy felt by the inferior Colleges, which owe their continuance in any shape mainly to the limitations imposed on the developement of their more meritorious rivals, can be powerful only so long as it is not openly avowed. Lodgings in connexion

with Colleges are another expedient which may be rapidly dismissed. The apprehension of a relaxed discipline is the only objection, and that may, perhaps, be worth something. Cambridge, where, if we mistake not, about half the students of the larger Colleges reside in lodgings, is commonly reputed to be less moral than Oxford; and from *post hoc* to *propter hoc* is an easy inference. There are, however, some reasons for doubting its validity in the present instance. So far as morality, in the common sense of the term, is promoted by actual restraint, its guardianship is in the hands of the University Proctor, rather than in those of the College Tutor. The necessity of being in doors by midnight, in Mr. Pattison's words, affords no great amount of protection; and that, such as it is, may be secured, though not perfectly, by making the lodging-house keepers responsible to the Colleges for their lodgers. The educational routine of the College would be equally binding on in-door and out-door pupils. On the other hand, the good effects of the Cambridge system are clear and unequivocal. It is sufficient to say that it enables the first College in Europe to double the number of its students.

The next plan recommended in the Report finds its precedent not in Cambridge but in the Scottish and Continental Universities—that of independent lodgings. It is, in fact, a return to the ancient University system, when Colleges were not; and as such, is sure to be vigorously opposed by all whom interest or conviction engages on the side of the existing monopoly. It has, however the warm approbation of the Commissioners, who evidently expect far greater results from it than from any other project of extension. There can be little doubt that they are right. No better, because no more direct means can be devised for placing an Oxford education within the reach of *all* who may happen to wish for it. We do not believe, as we have said repeatedly, that any large accession is to be expected from classes who are at present excluded not so much by formal enactments, as by the necessities of English life; but there will always be some natures willing to accept education at the risk of a future struggle for existence, and in their case the compulsory expenditure of a College course operates as a real disfranchisement. All that they ask is to be allowed to live in Oxford as they would in any other place, without having to submit to a system not calculated for their special exigencies. For such men a cheap hall might have some advantages, but it would

have many drawbacks, independently of the outlay necessary for its establishment. Even the regulations to which the Commissioners propose to subject these lodgings would have to be cautiously applied, so as not to interfere with that private and personal character which belongs to all really economical living. On the other hand, there would be little fear that lodgers of this class would abuse their liberty. The circumstances of their connexion with the University would be a far more efficient safeguard to them than the discipline of College officers, which they would be without, or that of the Proctors, to which they would still be amenable. Permission to live independently in lodgings, the Commissioners naturally presume would only be granted on special application to the Vice-Chancellor, who might easily command sufficient information as to the antecedents of the applicant. It is merely in accordance with the analogy of ordinary life that the sons of the poor should require, as they receive, less of vigilant superintendence than those of the rich. These considerations, we trust, may serve to quiet the alarms which are already beginning to be expressed at the mere announcement of so revolutionary a proposal.

At any rate, the last point raised by the Commissioners is one at which even timidity itself need not be startled. It appears that persons unconnected with the University are at present allowed to be present at professorial lectures, and even to receive certificates of attendance, so that all that is needed is that the permission should not be withdrawn when the Professoriate becomes really active, and every subject of knowledge is expounded with the same ability and zeal which is now extended only to two or three.

It may be fairly pleaded, too, that the advocates of University extension have a right to have their disabilities removed. We feel as they do, that practice is the only test of the truth or falsehood of their anticipations; and when what is asked is not protection, but simply freedom to act, it would be the mere prejudice of ultra-conservatism to refuse the request. The following appeal is from one of the most efficient of the tutorial body, Mr. Pattison:—

"Instead of guessing in the dark at the probable effect, [of these plans,] let us make the experiment. Let it not be forgotten that we diverted the Great Western Railway to Didcot, for fear of its bad effects on our discipline. What is urged is not the creation of any new machinery, not that the University should undertake to do any thing more, but that an

oppressive restriction should be removed, and the field thrown open to private enterprise and energy. When free, this will speedily run into the best channels. Let us leave halls and colleges, old and new, all with unlimited liberty of admission to work together, and trust to the power of self-adjustment in things which will bring to the surface the capabilities of the several methods. It might be allowed for ten years; nothing will have been done that cannot then be recalled. If the evil now anticipated should be found to result from lodging in the town, we shall then be warranted in recalling the students within the walls, and shall be supported by public opinion in so doing. Or private munificence, or government, would then more probably come forward to erect *hospitia* to meet a proved need than to provide for a probable one. It might be found that both methods (*i.e.*, halls and lodging out) would work well together, as accommodating different classes of persons. There would always be found persons who would be willing to pay the existing high rates for the advantages they believe to attach to domestication under our roofs; while all that class who cannot afford £120 to £130 per annum, but who could afford from £60 to £80, would, by this single enactment, be admitted to the general benefits of University education. It is incumbent, indeed, on a University to be cautious and deliberate in all its proceedings. But experiments are not necessarily rash—there are wise ones; there are even wise experiments in legislation which do not answer, and then to desist from them involves no disgrace. On the other hand, nothing would be more feeble than for us to emerge from this crisis of opinion with a scheme of paltry reforms. A great measure vindicates itself, and helps its own success. The present is a moment which may be made very decisive. I would earnestly press, not indeed the more comprehensive measure that one could wish for—for that the public mind, either in the University or the country, is not prepared—but such an extension as will at least set agitation on that subject at rest for some years to come. We in Oxford are weary of scheming, suggesting, and pamphleteering. Give us leave to be doing something. Untie our hands, and open our gates, and let us at least try if we can attract here, and can usefully deal with that large circle of youth whom we are told we ought to have here. If only a little relaxation is given us, and if then our numbers do not increase, it will be impossible to avoid ascribing that to the usual abortiveness of half measures. But, indeed, the utmost that is now asked for is truly little. The ideal of a national university is that it should be co-extensive with the nation—it should be the common source of all the higher (or secondary) instruction for the country; but the proposed measure would, after all, only go part of the way towards making it co-extensive with that part of the nation which supports the Established Church."—*Evidence*, pp. 43, 44.

Whatever we may think of University extension, we cannot doubt that it is the interest of Oxford to place herself in the

hands of men of this stamp. Their labours may be fatal to sinecures and monopolies, but they will not injure anything that is worth preserving. Ten years of their failures will do more for the University and the country, than ten years of the greatest success which can be attained in these days by the organized imbecility of a collegiate oligarchy.

We ought not to omit to mention that the Commissioners glance in passing at another sort of exclusion—that by religious Tests. The general question of the admission of Dissenters is one which they were instructed not to entertain, though several of those who have given evidence condemn the present policy in terms much more decided than those just quoted from Mr. Pattison: but they consider that the particular mode of exclusion comes fairly within the scope of their inquiry in connexion with the morality and discipline of the University. Accordingly, they proceed briefly but emphatically to enumerate their objections to the existing practice of subscription, censuring it as arbitrary, indefinite, and harassing, uncertain in operation, and generally demoralizing. As we wish to imitate their conciseness, we will only copy their conclusion, in which we cordially coincide:—"We do not offer any suggestion as to the manner in which the evil should be remedied; but we must express our conviction that the imposition of subscription, in the manner in which it is now imposed in the University of Oxford, habituates the mind to give a careless assent to truths which it has never considered, and naturally leads to sophistry in the interpretation of solemn obligations."

From the taught the Report naturally passes to the teaching and the teachers. We need not follow it into the history of the old Laudian examination for the B.A. degree, further than to notice an extraordinary statement by the present Hebdomadal Board, who, in their Letter to the Duke of Wellington on the announcement of the Commission, speak of "the academic system of study" as having been "admirably arranged in 1636, at a time when not only the nature and faculties of the human mind were exactly what they are still, and must of course remain, but the principles also of sound and enlarged intellectual culture were far from imperfectly understood." Will our readers believe that this system, within a short time of its establishment, fell into a neglect from which it has never recovered, partly from defects in its provisions, partly from the culpable compli-

city of the authorities? It is now superseded by another, resembling it neither in the subjects of study, nor in the mode of examination, which, after existing for half a century without any very substantial change, has recently, though with great difficulty, and in spite of pertinacious opposition, been made to undergo considerable reforms. Even as it is, however, it exhibits grave faults, which are duly noted, though not wholly remedied by the Commissioners.

The most crying sin of the unreformed system was, that it demanded from the student either too much or too little. It demanded too much, if we look to its nominal requirements, involving a real proficiency in three very different branches of knowledge—classical philology, moral and mental philosophy, and Greek and Roman history. It demanded too little, if we judge it by the results which were practically found to satisfy an examiner, a certain acquaintance with the language and substance of twelve or thirteen books, most of them single works of some classical author, a facility in recollecting and using the jargon of contradictory systems of philosophy, and a moderate—sometimes a very moderate—measure of skill in Greek and Latin composition. The end proposed was the imparting of general cultivation; the means adopted were the destruction or injury of any special aptitude which the student might possess by compelling him to bestow time and trouble on subjects which were never likely to engage his mind to any purpose, though they might very well succeed in dissipating it. This evil has been aggravated rather than mitigated by the authors of the late reforms. Two new schools are added to the old bipartite divisions of Classics and Mathematics, viz., those of Physical Science and of Modern History; but the great advantage to be expected from such an enlargement, the comprehension of students whom a narrower range of subjects had failed to attract, is neutralized by a clause requiring every candidate for a degree to pass through two schools out of the four. And while this new grievance is added, the old one remains substantially untouched. *Besides the Greek and Latin languages*—such are the words of the statute—candidates for classical honours are to be prepared with philosophy and ancient history as before. Those who know experimentally what the Greek and Latin languages include will smile at the *πάντολμος ἀμαθία*, the confident sciolism, which thus parenthetically assumes an acquaintance with them on the part of an undergraduate as a sort of preliminary requisite. Practically, we believe, the words are

likely to become mere surplusage, philosophy and ancient history alone being required. In other words, classical scholarship is to have no place whatever in the final examination. This is certainly one way of getting rid of a self-imposed difficulty. Oxford is to have a school of *literæ humaniores*, from which humane letters, so called, are to be expressly excluded—Hamlet with the character of Hamlet omitted by particular request. The Commissioners do not seem to have anticipated this solution, which has been announced since their Report appeared. They are sensible, however, that classical scholarship in Oxford requires an encouragement which no system of examinations, reformed or unreformed, has yet supplied; and they see that the only thing to be done is to give it a department of its own. Yet even they are not free from the Oxford vice of overloading. They talk of a school of philosophy, which is to embrace not only Latin and Greek, but Sanscrit and the Oriental languages, and also those of modern Europe. It is true that they would allow the student to select one or more languages as his especial study. But this, if really carried out, would create not one school but many, with different subjects and different examiners, while in practice it would probably come to the exaction of a superficial acquaintance with most or all of the languages included. The conception of an examination in *comparative* philology, which seems to lie at the bottom of this proposal, is sufficiently disposed of by Sir William Hamilton in his elaborate appendix on *Oxford as it might be*, (subjoined to his recent republication of *Discussions on Philosophy*, &c.,) from which it may be worth while to extract a few sentences. "This doctrine," that of ethnology, "most curious and important in itself, is, *as a result to be taken upon trust*, so limited, that it may be comprised in a brief book, in fact, in a single table: whereas, *if intelligently known*, that is, in its grounds, it imposes an acquaintance with some ten, twenty, fifty,—in truth, with above a hundred languages and dialects. Now, to institute a chair for a professor to retail his second-hand opinions is sufficiently foolish; but the lectures would be equally inept for academical education were the professor, instead of speaking on the authority of others, himself a Mezzofanti and a Grimm in one: himself cognizant of all the relations of all the languages on which he founds: for the pupils would still be only passive recipients of another's dicta, and *their* comparative philology, at least, would at best be the philology of patriots. . . . Ethnology is thus

misplaced in being made a subject of academical discipline, objectively, an important knowledge, it remains, subjectively, an unimportant mechanism."—(Pp. 690, 691, note.) The same high authority, however, emphatically recommends the cultivation of "another philology." "Nothing," he says, "can better exercise the mind than a rational study, either of the grammar of a known language, or of universal grammar, illustrated by the languages with which a student is acquainted. Here every doctrine of the teacher is elaborated by the taught. Yet this most valuable science, (an applied logic and psychology,) and most profitable exercise of mind, is wholly neglected in our Universities." We trust that this reproach will not long continue to attach to Oxford, though we doubt the existence of energy within the University sufficient to effect its removal. It might be difficult, however, to make a satisfactory division of subjects. Applied logic and psychology would seem rather to belong to a school of mental philosophy, such as the Commissioners proceed to advocate. Indeed, Sir William Hamilton himself, in a subsequent part of his Appendix, (p. 732,) when he comes to speak definitely of the subjects proper for a University course, holds very different language. He there discriminates the two kinds of knowledge which he would connect with the highest academical distinction as empirical and rational—the former a knowledge of the *fact*, comprehending "all dexterity at language, all familiarity with literary products, all acquaintance with historical record . . . limited to the domain of Greek and Roman letters," the latter a knowledge of the *cause* or *reason*, comprehending, "in a proximate sphere, the science of mind, in its faculties, its laws, and its relations, (Psychology, Logic, Morals, Politics, &c.); in a less proximate sphere, the science of the instrument of mind, (Grammar, Rhetoric, Poetic, &c.) The first he would call the department (or school) of humane letters, the second that of philosophy. "The present confusion," he says, "of the empirical and the rational, in the one department of *literæ humaniores*, originates in the inability of the tutors, as at present constituted, to teach philosophy as it was taught of old, and as by statute it should be taught still." Just as the reflection may be, we doubt whether the evil would be really remedied by the division proposed. "The nature and faculties of the human mind" may be the same now as they were in 1636, even in the case of an Oxford undergraduate: but, in those days, the body of rational knowledge, if ac-

quired at all, (a point about which the Commissioners are judiciously sceptical,) was acquired in seven years, not in three or four. As it is, we tremble to think of the probable results of a formal examination, not only in Psychology, Logic, Morals, and Politics, but in Grammar, Rhetoric, and Poetic. We know of but one man who would be bold enough to undertake any office in connexion with such a school, and that man is Mr. Sewell. Surely the four first-named subjects would be amply sufficient for a high department, without the addition of the three last. On the other hand, it does not seem unreasonable to expect an *intelligent* knowledge of Greek and Latin—a knowledge, that is, of principles as well as of facts—both from teachers and learners. The examination in that, in short, should include all the requisites which are usually understood to concur in forming an accomplished classical scholar. We would exclude “all acquaintance with historical record,” thinking, with the Commissioners, that history may properly claim a separate school, in which there need be no distinction of ancient and modern. Sir William Hamilton, it is true, does not wish to confine one class of students to rational, and another to empirical knowledge. On the contrary, he thinks that a minimum, not in one, but in each, ought to be established as the condition of a degree at all. We can only repeat our conviction, that a student who is expected to know many things will, as a general rule, know nothing to any purpose. Surely what is wanted is a knowledge, both rational and empirical, of some one subject. In earlier years instruction is naturally miscellaneous: the memory is the only faculty in full development, and the boy is taught a variety of things of which it is judged important that he should know something. But, as the other mental powers become matured, special education is seen to be more and more of a necessity, with reference, not merely to a professional occupation, but to the culture of the mind itself. It is precisely because, with Sir William Hamilton, we should lament to see our Universities “declining into popular seminaries for the cultivation of the superficial, the amusing, the palpable, the materially useful,” that we would have the Oxford student, in the last year of his pupilage, left perfectly free to take his own course—free to concentrate himself on classics, or mental philosophy, or history, or mathematics, so that the progress which he makes may be genuine, and the honours which are awarded to him really significant.

With regard to the further object which

the Commissioners hope to attain, by a reform of academical studies, the restoration of a connection between the Universities and the learned professions, we must confess ourselves still unconvinced. We think, as we said in our previous article, that the separation which has taken place has been owing, not only to the shortcomings of the Universities, but to the general course of society, so that we can have no great faith in any merely intra-academical remedy. To the case of Theology, indeed, this remark does not apply. If divinity students are driven to seek instruction elsewhere, at Wells, or Chichester, it is mainly because Oxford offers them none. Even the moral disadvantages, which, as Mr. Lake justly remarks, make a University an undesirable place for candidates for orders, are, to a certain extent, curable. Nor can we see any sufficient reason why Theology should not be made the subject of examinations and honourable distinctions. Such a stimulus would increase knowledge: it would not diminish reverence. It is not the scholar, but the dunce—not the candidate for honours, but the aspirant to an ordinary degree—who speaks and thinks disrespectfully of his books. On the other hand, it would be difficult to overrate the evils arising from the “lack of knowledge.” Whatever dangers may threaten the Church of England, none can be greater than the distrust produced by the conviction that there are questions which the clergy, as a body, are unprepared to meet. A really educated clergyman is a “restorer of belief,” quite independently of any influence which he may excite by teaching or writing. But from the schools of jurisprudence and physical science we expect no such important results. It would be hopeless, as the Commissioners see, to establish in Oxford a strictly professional education; and the number of those who can afford time for any other is likely to become less, rather than greater. At the same time, we are quite disposed to believe that a considerable portion of legal and physical knowledge might be communicated through the medium of University lectures, and that an undergraduate would do well to get a foretaste of his profession before he begins to attend chambers, or walk the hospitals. Oxford may make her teaching useful to those who still come to her, without flattering herself with hopes of recovering those whom she has unavoidably lost.

We have lingered so long among the more important details of the Oxford examinations, that we can merely allude to those which remain behind. The Commis-

missioners recommend an examination at matriculation, but discourage one for the higher degrees. The first is absolutely required as a protection to the University against the facility of the inferior colleges, which not only sacrifice their own character, but lower the standard of the public examinations, by the admission of unqualified members. It might be well, as the Commissioners suggest, to allow deficiency in one branch to be compensated by proficiency in another, so as not to exclude those who have not had the advantage of the ordinary course of previous instruction. But to shut the gates of the University on incurable ignorance, whether voluntary or involuntary, whether found among the rich or the poor, is no more than common sense and common justice. In discussing the question of the higher degrees, the Commissioners have scarcely shewn their wonted courage or penetration. It may be desirable, under present circumstances, to let a higher degree follow as a matter of course, where a lower one has been fairly obtained; but it cannot be well that any degree should be conferred on a candidate whose qualifications are unknown. Yet this is what they propose in the case of Divinity and Law, both the degrees in which are supposed to be supplementary to the lower degree in Arts. Surely they might have seen that here at least was an opportunity of turning the new schools to some practical account. What would be easier than to make the lower degrees in Divinity, Law, and Medicine conditional in passing an examination in the schools of Theology, Jurisprudence, and Physical Science? The present practice of postponing these degrees to later periods of University standing is a mere anachronism, belonging to the Laudian system, with its long course of years. In a modern scheme they ought clearly to be allowed to fall into their natural place, so as to become co-ordinate with the degree of B.A., as at present conferred. The student, after graduating in some one of the non-professional schools, might offer himself for examination in that faculty in which he desired, for professional reasons, to obtain a degree. This would involve no addition to the existing requirements, which oblige a candidate for the B.A. degree to go through two schools at least, at the same time that it would introduce an intelligible distinction between those who wish to prosecute their non-professional studies and those who regard their academical education merely as subsidiary to some one of the professions. The degrees of the University would be made what they should be, a reality, while the indignity, as Mr.

Wall calls it, of examining senior men would be successfully avoided.

We now approach one of the most important parts of the Report—that which treats of the instruction of the University, with reference to the teachers. The historical sketch which we gave in our former Article must have enabled our readers to appreciate the difference in this respect between ancient and modern Oxford. The authorized teaching of the University was formerly conducted by the University itself: it is now in the hands of the Colleges—a change which has taken place in violation rather than in pursuance of the Statutes. To remedy this abuse, by establishing the Professorial system, not in place of, but by the side of the Tutorial, is the task to which the Commissioners have addressed themselves.

It was hardly to be expected that the existing regime would meet with extreme severity at the hands of the Commissioners. That men, most of whom either are or were recently in actual connection with the University, should canvass strictly the qualifications of a body, comprising the majority of the working residents, is not in human nature. Sir William Hamilton, however, is molested by no such scruples. With the unrelenting eye of a systematic philosopher, he investigates the antecedents of the Tutorial staff of each College, and the effects of their teaching, as shown in the academical successes of their pupils, combining the whole in a tabular view in which College is weighed against College with a minute accuracy extending even to fractions. The results of the comparison as regards particular Colleges, are not always such as the experience of an Oxford man would endorse—a fault owing to causes which it would be tedious to explain; but the general conclusion is clearly made out—the fact of an enormous difference between College and College, in respect of educational power. It would not be fair to rely wholly or principally on the success of the pupil as a proof of the competency of the tutor, though the two are generally supposed to bear some kind of relation to each other, and a College is to a certain extent responsible for the class of under-graduates whom its reputation attracts. But Sir William Hamilton stands on firm ground when he calls attention to the fact, that “in the two departments which the University possesses, and which the Colleges and Tutors are, *de facto*, exclusively authorized to teach, the whole Collegial Tutors (49) have only, of their body, in *Literæ Humaniores*, about a half (26), in Mathematics, about a sixth (8), of the first class;” and concludes that “if

there be any connection between superior knowledge and superior tuition, Oxford now abandons, indifferently, the work of education to competent and incompetent hands."—(P. 701.) We need not stop to remark that the test of the public examinations, though, of course, not infallible, is generally a fair one—not to mention that the University itself elects to be tried by it; and that, as a matter of fact, the most efficient Colleges are those which number most first class men among their tutors. It is of more importance to show that the result complained of is due entirely to the Colleges themselves. The nomination of tutors belongs, apparently by an *unstatutable* usurpation, solely to the Head of the College, who selects them almost invariably from the Fellows, preference being mostly given to seniority. Owing to the restrictions with which all the Colleges are more or less fettered, there are very few instances in which the election to a Fellowship is entirely open, so as to secure the services of the ablest man in the University not otherwise provided for. Thus, neither the persons in whom the choice of tutors is vested, the principle of choice, nor the field of choice, are such as to promise any large measure of educational success. If anything be wanted to complete the condemnation of the system, it is to be found in the sentence practically passed on it by the University itself in the tacit recognition of private tutors, a class of men who, as the Commissioners remark, though unknown to University or College statutes, exercise at once the personal supervision belonging to the original *Tutores*, and the privilege of free teaching which is the statutable right of all graduates. When we consider that this kind of instruction has become popular under infinite discouragement both direct and indirect, the real teaching of the best men in the University having, as is admitted by one of the most decided opponents of the system, Mr. Congreve, lain for some time past in the hands of the private tutors, though the money paid to them by the Students is not in place of but in addition to that which is exacted for College tuition, we shall learn what to think of the indefeasible right of a usurpation which has failed to justify itself not only in the eyes of the world, but even in those of its perpetrators. What plea can be urged in favour of those who are found wanting, when weighed in a balance which they have themselves been allowed to trim?

The means by which the Commissioners propose to remedy this state of things are, the reform of the Colleges and the reanima-

tion of the Professoriate. The Tutors are to be left in *statu quo*, security being taken for their fitness by the removal of the restrictions on Fellowship elections, while those whom they have supplanted are re-established and fortified by fresh endowments drawn chiefly from the Colleges themselves. Under these circumstances, it is believed that the two systems would work well side by side, each occupying its own sphere without encroaching on that of the other. The Private Tutors are not to be directly interfered with: but hopes are expressed that their influence may be diminished, partly by the improvement of public instruction, and the greater facilities given to individual superintendence by the College Tutors, partly by the absorption of the more eminent among the Private Tutors themselves into the Professoriate, which is to have a lower department of University Lecturers, taking the more elementary part of the work, and acting as a sort of Professorial nursery.

The weak point of this arrangement appears to us to be that which affects the College Tutors. Nothing in our judgment can be said for retaining them in their present position, except the fact that they are in possession. We fully recognise the importance of a distinction between the Professorial and Tutorial functions. Sir William Hamilton's definition shews that both have their places in a University. "By Professor," he says, "I mean a teacher exclusively privileged to deliver from his own resources and at his own discretion, a course of lectures, on a certain department of knowledge, to the whole academical alumni. By Tutor, I mean a teacher, among others, privileged to see that his peculiar pupils (a section of the academical alumni) read and understand certain books, certain texts, codes, departments of doctrine, authorized by the University." But the question which naturally arises is, why should not these Tutors be *University Tutors*? Why should not men be appointed to the Tutorial office on account of their University reputation, not in virtue of their connexion with this or that College? Even supposing the Fellowships to be given away by merit, there is surely great awkwardness in a plan which divides the qualified men in the University into twenty-four houses, and makes their appointments depend on the accidental wants of the particular society with which they may be connected. Again, why should the choice of these Tutors be left in the hands of the Heads of Houses, a body for whose discernment in educational matters the University has no guarantee? Why

should the students be forced to attend the tuition supplied by the College to which they happen to attach themselves, when there may be other Tutorial lectures delivered elsewhere which would be of greater service to them? Differences between Tutor and Tutor will still exist after each College has done its best to secure the most competent men: and it is surely unjust to limit a Tutor's usefulness by the accommodation which the buildings of his College may chance to afford. Add to this, that even in a reformed Oxford the isolated character of small societies is sure to generate narrow and local feelings, petty rivalries, and a general disposition to estimate academical questions by a College rather than a University standard. The appointment of Examiners by the Proctors is at present retained on two grounds, that of justice to the Colleges, that University offices may descend to them in rotation, without reference to the comparative merit of their respective bodies of fellows, and that of justice to the undergraduates, that they may have tutors of their own to protect their interests against those of other candidates. We are not inventing motives, but merely repeating those which, if we are not greatly misinformed, have been actually assigned. Such views of justice are intelligible enough, but they are scarcely compatible with the educational action of a free University.

We think, then, that the Commissioners are mistaken in supposing that the continuance of College tuition is the best or the only way of combining the labours of Tutors and Professors. The proper functions of a College Tutor are moral rather than intellectual. Such was undoubtedly the original conception of the office, as it appears in the College Statutes, the Ordinances of Edward VI., and even the Laudian Code, though the latter superadds instruction to the Tutor's other duties. Such is, in effect, the theory current at the present hour in Cambridge, where though the Colleges have engrossed the education no less than at Oxford, the Tutor's business is not so much to lecture to his pupils as to look after their bills. Such, finally, is the view taken by the Commissioners themselves, when they are legislating for those students who are to be admitted to the University without belonging to any College or Hall. Their lodging-houses, we read in the Report, are to be "placed under the special superintendence of University officers, to be constituted Tutors or Guardians of the University students,"—men whose "duty would be, so far as the case permitted, to acquaint themselves with the character and circumstances

of these students, and to take all means in their power for exercising over them a due moral and religious superintendence." Yet it surely cannot be meant that these students are to go without tutorial instruction. What is necessary for residents in Colleges must be equally necessary for residents in unattached lodgings. The obvious solution is, the appointment of Tutors by the University. Their classes would be formed to suit the wants not of the undergraduates of each College, but of the aggregate mass. This would at once remove what is felt to be an inherent evil in the present system,—“that of crowding into the same class students differing greatly in knowledge and capacity, merely because they happen to come to the University at the same time.” Oxford would, in fact, realize the condition of a large public school, the chief difference being that the classes would consist not of boys, but of young men, and consequently that the scale of instruction as a whole would be higher, while the discipline enforced would be less irksome. The Professorial lectures would find their natural parallel in the instruction given to the Sixth Form at Eton or Rugby. The mechanical arrangement of the classes might be the same as that which now obtains in College lectures, men being drafted from one class to another without that inflexible regularity of promotion which is required where rewards and punishments have to be looked to as the principal motive powers. Sir William Hamilton, who goes into the subject very fully, (pp. 718–724,) proposes that honours should be awarded by the joint suffrage of pupils and teachers,—a suggestion probably better adapted to the latitude of Edinburgh or Glasgow than to that of Oxford. But we must not wander into details.

One complaint, at least, we may safely make of the Commissioners. If they found themselves unable or unwilling to reduce the College tutors to their normal dimensions, why could they not have followed the milder counsels of Mr. Clough, who sees “no reason why” the proficients of the several Colleges “should not be united in a College class, and the *viva* disjoined from the *mortua corpora*, by collegiate or inter-collegiate arrangements?” The concordat need hardly bear even on the less competent Tutors, who would merely be required to abandon what ought to be the distasteful work of lecturing on certain subjects with which they are not fully conversant. In any case, their anticipated remonstrances cannot be set against the palpable interest of the students. The practice of a public school, which we have

just referred to, will furnish us with an apt illustration. What would be said if the assistant-masters, instead of taking some a higher, some a lower form, were to claim to teach those boys, and those boys only, who happened to reside in their respective boarding houses, as a matter of justice to themselves, and as the only means of maintaining an influence over their pupils?

The reanimation of the professoriate is a measure for which it could hardly have been supposed that an apology would be needed. Anywhere but in Oxford Professor Vaughan's splendid vindication of his order, (*Evidence*, p. 274,) which we wish our space would allow us to extract, would read like the eulogy pronounced on Hercules by the sophist in the story. But the collegiate system is not only alien from, but antagonistic to the professoriate: and even the reform camp is recruited from the anti-professorial party. In extracting passages from the evidence of the most prominent of these recusants, Mr. Pattison, the Commissioners significantly express their belief that there are many persons entertaining sentiments of a similar kind. Mr. Pattison's own opinion, however, deserves attention in itself, from the ability with which he has unfolded and illustrated it, as well as from the character which is stamped on the portion of his evidence already quoted by us, that of a vigorous and decided reformer. In the course of delivering it, he reviews the intellectual history of the Universities in a rapid but effective sketch, which is well worth consulting for its own sake, independently of any arguments which may or may not be deducible from it. One thing is evident, that in denouncing professorial instruction, "the system of delivering courses of original dissertations to a miscellaneous audience," as superficial and unsatisfactory, he is not decrying a line in which he might not himself excel. Nevertheless, we cannot think that he has made out any case for his alarm. As the Commissioners well remark, his argument involves several assumptions;—the incompatibility of the professorial and tutorial systems—the absolute sufficiency of the former, and the inevitable superficiality of the latter. For the first of these, indeed, the Commissioners themselves are in some measure answerable. A reference to Mr. Pattison's evidence will show that his fears are excited by the proposed admission of unattached students, which he regards as a virtual substitution of professorial for tutorial instruction. The report shows that the apprehension is not groundless, as by refusing to separate the tutorial from the

collegiate system, the Commissioners apparently wish to leave these students without any tuition at all. But to protest against the abrogation of the tutoriate is one thing, and to assert its exclusive efficiency another. Yet Mr. Pattison, throughout, appears to think that he may do either indifferently. Because pupils require to be made to master standard books, he argues that they will not be the better for hearing original dissertations. Because theories are mere tumid verbiage to minds unfurnished with facts, he argues that the knowledge of facts is sufficient without them. Because in French and American education, as he supposes, showy and current accomplishment is the end desired, and exclusively professorial instruction the means adopted, he argues that the same result would follow in a country where both end and means are different. In one case, at least, we must take leave to question not only his inferences but his observation. Surely no one who had not an argument to maintain would speak of German instruction as *superficial*. "The absence of all taste in composition, and the fatal defects of expression," which Mr. Pattison laments in the great men of Germany, are precisely the faults which, as he admits himself, a superficial culture has excluded in the case of France. If their attainments are but the attainments of a few, what is to be said of the attainments of the graduates of Oxford? Will Mr. Pattison tell us that the majority of Oxford students are more thoroughly educated than the youths described in his quotation from Dr. Niemeyer? The distinction between the intellectual and educational value of a lecturer's original researches may be speculatively correct, but cannot go for much practically. Why should not a well-grounded and inquiring hearer—and we are speaking only of such—feel something of that "vivifying effect" which, according to Mr. Pattison's own admission, "we ourselves experience from new views?" The allegation that a professor is likely to be less useful than a book on the one hand, and than a tutor on the other, is another logical juggle. At worst he might surely be serviceable as combining a *portion* of the educational advantages of each. But we believe that beside this he might be something different from and, so far, superior to either. What that would be is expressed in the well-known words of Niebuhr, quoted by the Commissioners, (p. 96.) Of the "thousand thoughts" which are "awakened" by "the sight" of an assemblage of hearers, and the sense of "the personal relation in which they stand towards" their

professor, how few present themselves either to the writer or reader of a book, either to the catechiser or to the catechised student! At the close of his remarks Mr. Pattison virtually abandons his heresy by censuring the professorial system as the *main* method of education; but the surrender comes too late. Whether from dread of the supposed anti-tutorial tendencies of the Commissioners, or from involuntary one-sidedness, he has certainly contrived to produce the impression that he is altogether opposed to professorial instruction. We are sorry for the result, as it takes away from the effect of at least one remark which as we shall see presently, is really valuable. But we would not punish him further than by wishing that he may himself become a member of an active professoriate in a regenerate Oxford.

A more tangible objection to the restoration of the professoriate might be, that it is the revival of a system which has already died a natural death. But we demur to the fact. The death of the professoriate was not natural, having been caused partly by want of proper sustenance, partly by actual violence. The Laudian Examinations had no connexion with professorial lectures: the latter examinations were not established till professorial teaching had ceased to exist. The professorship of Moral Philosophy we know to have been deliberately stifled for more than one hundred and fifty years by a private compact among the electors. Now that it has recovered its existence, it has shown that it is abundantly endowed with inherent vitality. Four other of the statutable readerships were illegally extinguished by the Hebdomadal Board, at what time and under what circumstances we know not; and the re-establishment of one of these has been attended with sufficient success to show that the day for a University prælator of Logic is by no means passed. As for the Chairs of the other sciences, which, as forming part of the Oxford course, might afford a test of the efficiency or inefficiency of the professoriate, we do not know how they first became ineffective, but we know why they still continue so. The Professor of Ancient History delivers no available lectures; the Professor of Greek none whatever. The Professor of Latin does not exist even in name. On the other hand, Dr. Arnold's and Professor Vaughan's lectures on Modern History drew crowded audiences before the University held out any inducement to the study of that subject. There is no need to fear that the ears of the undergraduates are closed. "*Dein Herz ist zu, dein Sinn ist todt.*"

The details of the restoration may be difficult in practice, but they are comparatively easy to arrange in theory. It will be necessary to found new professorships, and to increase the endowments of existing Chairs. Every subject which the University undertakes to teach ought to have one or more professors, as the case may be. At present the only department which can be said to be adequately endowed is that of Theology, which has seized on several of the canonries of Christ Church. The lay professors will require to have their numbers and their incomes raised in proportion. The Report justly says, that £800 a year is the least which they have a right to expect. Whence the funds are to be drawn we shall see before long. To all these recommendations, which the Commissioners pursue into minute particulars, we give our hearty assent. If they are not carried out it will only be because the strength of possession is stronger than the strength of reason. We agree, too, that professorships should be freed from all restrictions whatever, except the *negative* theological test provided by the statute, which forbids all professors to impugn the faith of the Church of England. On the mode of appointing professors the Commissioners would have done well to consult an elaborate article by Sir William Hamilton in the *Edinburgh Review* for April 1834, containing a large historical induction in favour of the establishment of a body of curators for this special object. Meantime there is much to be said for the two kinds of patronage which the Report most favours—that by the Crown, and that by the Reformed Congregation. The latter may at any rate safely be preferred to such existing nuisances as election by Convocation, by graduates in Divinity, by the Hebdomadal Board. At present the standing evils of elections within the University are two—collegiate interest and theological party. The former will be impaired by any measure tending to establish an extra-collegiate power, such as the new House of Congregation, *once fairly constituted*, might be expected to be. The latter will probably never disappear till Oxford ceases to be a Church University; and even then it is quite possible that secular Chairs may be made objects of struggle between rival denominations. For ourselves, we hope as much from the mere multiplication of professorships as from any more direct guarantee of purity of election. Where there are many prizes the fever of intrigue will necessarily cool, and honest men will be more likely to get their due.

The project of University lecturers certainly looks well at first sight. If introduced

into Oxford as it now is, or under the circumstances contemplated by the Commissioners, it would undoubtedly do great good, principally by affording congenial employment to unplaced talent and learning. But it may be doubted how far the duties of these lecturers would be distinguished from those of the tutors, except by the factitious concomitants of exemption from College restraints, and a sort of hereditary expectancy of a professorship. The professor, as we have seen, delivers original expositions: the tutor sees that his pupils know their books: but what is the lecturer to do? In a thoroughly reformed system, where tutorial as well as professorial labours were regulated and economized by the University, the difficulty would doubtless be felt and provided for.

Before leaving the Report on the professoriate, we must note, briefly but gravely, one great omission. No place whatever is made for those scholars and men of science whose vocation it may be to teach by the pen rather than by the tongue. Professor Vaughan has done justice to the utility of "silent men" in a strain of commanding eloquence, which the Commissioners actually quote, as if unconscious of its meaning. Another of those who have given evidence has made this particular deficiency the keynote of all his suggestions. Even Mr. Patison, in his academical scheme, has found room for a professor who is "not the organ of instruction," but "the man of greatest attainment in his branch, rewarded and withdrawn from instruction, to enable him to devote himself to the cultivation of the more abstruse parts of his science." But the Commissioners apparently ignore altogether either the existence or the desirability of such an element. In this at least they are sure to have the vulgar on either side.

We pass, *sicco pede*, over a few pages of detail about scholarships, prizes, libraries, and museums, as adapted rather for special than for general consideration. The question of the University revenues is equally technical, and embarrassed with the further difficulty of the absence of authentic information, owing to the refusal of the authorities to comply with requests made in the name of their royal Visitor. All that we can do is to endorse the five recommendations of the Commissioners,—the publication of the University accounts, the publication of all fees and their application, and the reduction of their amount, the confinement of academical revenues to academical objects, (a most important point, as unenlightened majorities are at present in the habit of voting away the trust-money of the corporation for ob-

jects which, though ostensibly public, are really, as regards the University, of a private nature, such as the support of colonial Episcopacy), the repeal of the stamp duty on matriculations and degrees, and the granting of a license of mortmain to enable the University to invest its funded property in land. The remainder of our space must be devoted to the last, and in some respects the most serious question mooted in the Report—the Reform of the Colleges.

We have already said that we are not going to tell twice the tale of the foundation of these institutions, nor to slay the slain arguments in support of their inviolability. In a national document like the Report, it is right that the historical truth should be formally stated, and the current fallacies judicially disallowed; but a reviewer, having once gone over the ground, may be excused from traversing it again. A different reason prevents us from discussing another part of this division of the subject—the special recommendations with regard to particular Colleges. Whatever means we may have for judging of their appropriateness, we can hardly presume that those whom we address will have been similarly favoured; and when we think of the errors into which Sir William Hamilton has fallen in his estimate of the "educational eminence" of Merton and Corpus, we may well shrink from the task of descanting on academical mysteries to a purely lay reader. Our remarks shall therefore be confined to the general reforms suggested as necessary for the whole collegiate body. The abolition of all local and family restrictions on fellowships is, of course, the first thing. The restrictions to particular schools are removed in the case of fellowships, continued in that of scholarships. New College, however, is made an exception, being allowed to retain its connexion with Winchester, though the old ties are to be readjusted. We cannot understand the ground of this exemption. The only shadow of a reason which appears in the evidence is contained in the words "Notwithstanding, few persons would be willing to give up the associations of William of Wykeham," following immediately on a statement of the practical evils of the connexion. How can the associations of William of Wykeham, in any true or high sense, be said to be preserved by the spectacle of a College paralyzed by an indissoluble alliance with a single school, not of the first rank? However, the next recommendation of the Commissioners makes some amends for this momentary feebleness. The obligation of fellows to orders is entirely swept away, and an inestimable benefit con-

ferred not only on education, literature, and the other professions, but on the clergy. It might have been expected that the obligation to celibacy would have followed; but the fear of ridicule has prevailed, and the restriction is retained on grounds which apply only to tutors, and even as regards them are by no means impregnable. The obligation to residence is to be annulled statutely, as it has long been annulled practically. The property disqualification, as it may be called, is to be put on a uniform and more intelligible footing, income as well as property being included, and the disqualifying amount raised. All compulsion to proceed to higher degrees is to be removed—an arrangement which would not have been required if those degrees had been rationally dealt with. Something is to be done towards purifying College Elections, by substituting in the larger societies electoral boards in the place of universal suffrage, by abolishing all nominations by persons or bodies external to the College, and by extending the right of appeal to the visitor from decisions presumably unstatutable to decisions presumably not according to merit. Certain fellowships are to be specifically appropriate to proficients in the new university studies. Colleges are to be compelled to found open scholarships adequate in number and value. The wealthier societies, such as All Souls, New College, Queen's, Magdalen, Merton, and Corpus, are to receive from one to six professors, for whose benefit a certain proportion of the fellowships are to be suppressed. University lecturers are to be ordinary fellows of Colleges, living partly on their fellowships, partly on fees from their pupils, and allowed to marry. The Election to Headships of Colleges is still to be vested in the fellows, who, however, are to be permitted to choose any Master of Arts. Lastly, visitors are to require annual reports from their respective Colleges, and transmit such reports to the Queen in Council.

All this, bold as it is in some respects, and likely to be beneficial so far as it goes, appears to us essentially unsatisfactory. It is, in fact, mere tinkering—an attempt to improve a thing which is not partially but wholly unsuitable. College life at one time meant something very definite, comprehensible, and real. College life now means nothing of the kind. A fellow used to be a poor student, following an ecclesiastical rule, performing certain duties, religious and domestic, and receiving a small payment. A fellow is now a clergyman, a lawyer, a physician, a London habitué, differing in no respect from other clergymen, lawyers, physicians, and habitués, except that he is

presumably a man of superior education, possesses £200 a-year of his own, and is unmarried. Even resident fellows are precisely like other resident graduates, the only distinguishing features, in addition to those already named, being that they sometimes attend daily service, dine together whenever they have no better engagement, meet occasionally for the nominal performance of business, which is really performed by officials, and live in rooms instead of in lodgings. Again, the collegiate framework is not necessary to the existence of tutors: their present lectures might be delivered in University lecture-rooms, their present superintendence exercised over halls or boarding-houses. All powerful as the Colleges are in the University, the University cannot be said to gain anything by their organization. The good that is done in Oxford could be done without such a machinery. After this we need not add, that the machinery itself is something worse than harmless. Perhaps there is no evil greater than the atmosphere of unreality which it tends to produce. As we observed just now in the case of New College and Winchester, men imagine that they are carrying out the work of a mediæval founder, when they are pursuing occupations which, even when most useful and laudable, are totally different from anything contemplated by him. Hence arises a waste of effort, a yearning after hopeless ideals, the more to be regretted in proportion to the greater elevation and purity of the natures so employed. The real wants, intellectual and moral, of the age and nation are ignored and despised in the vain attempt, however disguised from the mind itself, to recall an irrevocable past. Leisure and quiet, and means of study, which might be engaged in satisfying the inquiries of a busy but speculative century, are used only to thwart them. The theological history of the last twenty years is no more than a logical deduction from the operation of the collegiate system. It was no mere accident that connected the Tracts for the Times with the Oriel Common Room, and the persecution of Dr. Hampden with the Corpus Committee. And while the higher minds are exhausted by this unreality, the lower are filled by realities of a very earthly sort. Community of life, to which special duties are not attached, naturally comes to be synonymous with community of indulgence. Jobbing is proverbially the vice of corporations; and small corporations, without any definite object, are peculiarly liable to it. The injunction which is at present found in the statutes of some Colleges, to prefer a member of the society in an academical election to any other candi-

date, is a duty which naturally commends itself to a Fellow's moral sense. Not many years ago four close Colleges, distinguished for nothing but the number of their fellows, formed a league which went by the appropriate name of the Unholy Alliance, for the express object of carrying elections. This conspiracy against the University was at last broken up by a disagreement among the conspirators about the division of the spoil, but not until it had procured the exclusion of several men enjoying a university reputation in favour of persons undistinguished before or since. The opening of the foundations may possibly prevent the repetition of such a scandal as this; but it will not remove the unmeaningness or inexpediency of the system. Even when a fellowship is open, it is nothing better than a scanty celibate sinecure. Even after the new professors have taken their share, a number of these sinecures will still remain—and it is scarcely possible that many of them should not be ill bestowed. If a College had no more appointments than were absolutely required for the work it had to do, there might be some security for the choice of fit men: but the permission of non-residence shews that this is not expected under the new regime. It may be right that a certain portion of the resources of Oxford should be employed to help men who have distinguished themselves there on entering upon a profession: but why not let this be done fairly and openly by means expressly calculated for the end? In a word, why suffer any part of the academical revenue to be apportioned without a special object, recognised and provided for as such? Why make the distribution of the intellectual and educational forces of the University depend in any way on the accidental existence of twenty-four houses? If tutorships are desirable, why not let them exist for their own sake? If professors require maintenance, why billet them on societies with which they have nothing to do, and to which they might possibly be uncongenial? These are questions which, it is obvious, strike at the root of the Collegiate system, not only as it is, but as it will be, if the suggestions of the Report should take effect. Whether they have ever occurred to the Commissioners themselves is more than we can pretend to guess. But we can well understand why they should have been kept out of sight on the present occasion. In any case, however, there is no reason why a reviewer should not ask them.

Nevertheless, after all our objections, we must return to our original verdict. If the Report is open to some criticisms, we

feel that they may be made without detracting from its substantial excellence. And though we might ourselves wish to re-write a few of its pages, we more than doubt whether we should allow that privilege to any one else. "Pass it, pass it!" was the exclamation with which the most enlightened and most independent of Liberal journals greeted the promulgation of the Reform Bill in 1831. So our desire is that the recommendations of the Commissioners may become law as quickly as possible, without change or modification. In Parliament, most of those acquainted with the condition of the Universities are hostile to reform; and if the Liberals descend to the discussion of particular points, in the hope of introducing improvements, they may be deceived into letting go the very things which Reformers within the Universities feel to be the most precious. Let them beware of Mr. Gladstone in committee.

-
- ART. II.—1. *Acta Laboratorii Chymici Monacensis seu Physica Subterranea*. (Leipz. 1703. STAHL's edition of BECCHER's principal work.)
2. *G. E. Stahl's Fundamenta Chymiae Dogmatico-Rationalis et Experimentalis, &c.* Norimbergae, 1747.
3. *Experiments upon Magnesia Alba, Quicklime, &c.* By JOSEPH BLACK, M.D. Edinburgh, 1782.
4. *Traité Élémentaire De Chimie, &c.* Par M. LAVOISIER, de l'Académie des Sciences, &c. Paris, 1789.
5. *Leçons sur La Philosophie Chimique, &c.* Par M. DUMAS, recueillies par M. BINAUD. Paris, 1837.

THE polypharmacists of the Arabian school of medicine, and the alchemists of mediæval Europe, followed ideas so transcendental that, in so far as their ever-vanishing aims were concerned, they at first sight seem to stand in no true historical relation with the moderate and practical chemists of the present century. The seeking for the alcahest or universal solvent, the attempt to extract the elixir of life, the effort to lay hands on the philosophical stone, (and that among the mist and darkness of a time which was rather the night than the morning of science), were things essentially unlike the sober and attainable aims of our own positive chemistry; and the men of our laboratories could have taken little interest in the labours they involved, had it not been

for the fact that those old scholastics, chasing images they were never to seize, worked out thousands of incidental results. If they went after the illusions of the dawn, shaped out of the murk by the twisted rays of a sun which was yet far below their horizon, it was on the solid ground of nature that they sped their weary hunt; and many a trophy they found lying in the twilight, ready for their early hands, sometimes dazzling them into false perception again, but always rewarding their pains. If they were fond idealists, if they were visionaries, they were also chemists; and it is as chemists that they deserve the recognition of the world. They worked with water, they worked with fire; they digested, boiled, distilled, roasted, burned, smelted, crystallized, set agoing putrefactions and fermentations; in short, they put in operation the same sorts of processes upon the same sorts of stuff as ourselves. Following their hereditary and antique elemental ideas, they were the first discoverers of those material principles and compounds, which are commonly called chemicals. Trying to scale the heavens, they began to subdue the earth. It has been remarked, that those of the polypharmacists, regarding whom there is any information extant, seem to have been vastly more taken up with their pharmacological preparations than with their panaceal speculation; while the really great men among the alchemists, from Roger Bacon down even to Paracelsus, were the busy students of such chemical reactions as could then be brought within the reach of the experimentalist, and made no personal pretensions to the stone.* The hypothetical idea of both these successive schools, namely, the transmutation or elevation of the metals and the analogous elevation of man's fallen and sickly body into the state of golden health, seems at all times to have been a very separable thing from the everyday occupations and practical hopes of the higher order of adepts; although it certainly vitiated their observations not a little, and corrupted the phraseology of their works through and through, if it did not demoralize their intellectual habits in some degree. Soon after the insolent, but gallant and imperative protest of Aureolus Theophrastus Bombastes Paracelsus, modestly so self-styled, against the pseudo aristotelianism of the medical school of his day, the alchemical theory and the alchemical practice of genuine observation in the laboratory fell asunder;—one might say, always under censure

for a play upon words, that the Arabian particle separated itself by fissipation from the good Greek noun, if Greek it be; the oriental Al took itself off, and left chemistry to pursue its own fortunes. The ancient eastern element, however, did not at once disappear from the earth; for it retained its devotees, no longer respectable because behind their age, till the close of last century; and indeed it has them yet, old half-witted men and younger monomaniacs not a few; happy creatures, ignoring all the results of growing science, and catching at the gifts of nature with ineffectual hands, like ghosts at a feast! On the other hand, those of the sons of the prophets, who at this parting of the ways chose the path of true chemistry, were men of much diligence and sound understandings, and they addicted themselves with zeal to the finding out of all sorts of new chemicals and chemical reactions. Van Helmont had begun life as an alchemist, not in the sinister sense of the word; but he ended his career as a chemist of some degree of worthiness, although he will perhaps be better known to posterity as the originator of that hypothesis concerning an all-pervading cosmical fluid, which has been elaborated in later times by Mesmer and Reichenbach. Libavius, who came upon the fuming chloride of tin, Cassius, whose purple precipitate of gold is as beautiful and curious as ever, Glauber, whose 'wonderful salt' is still the friend of horses and horse-doctors, and the sensible though prosy Agricola, deserve remembrance for their industry and the number of single facts they found out; and it must never be forgotten that it was little better than an unmitigated chaos of things and thoughts, in the thick of which they had to do their poor day's-work. It should also be observed in their praise that, if they were a kind of learned artisans rather than men of science, it was particularly in their persons that (what Comte not happily calls) the metaphysical epoch of scientific history was reaching towards a higher stage of development; namely, toward the positive epochal method, the era of Descartes and Bacon, the day of experimental observation and the inductive syllogism.

It will be readily understood how, as soon as the mind of science was withdrawn from aims which were too lofty for its reach, and was then unreservedly directed to the positive labours of the laboratory, there would quickly succeed a remarkable extension of practical or concrete chemistry. The only thing that could compensate the emancipated votaries of alchemy for the giving up of their great ideal, and thereby appease the craving

* Alchemy and the Alchemists. Chambers' Papers for the People, No. 66.

of the soul for greatness of some sort or another, was the rapid accumulation of a great mass of new information. Ideal had to be substituted by material wonderfulness, sublimity by size, depth by surface: and it must be confessed even by the lingering disciples of the alchemical mysticism, if such posthumous and undated spirits can turn aside for a moment from their enchanted toils, that the number of solid and liquid bodies, curious for their aspect or for their properties as chemical reagents, acids, alkalis, salts, mixts, calxes, precipitates, sublimate, essences, oils, butters and spirits, which were brought out of nature at this period, was astonishing. It is impossible, indeed, for the most positive and the least speculative of the chemists of the present day, were it even a Rose among his platinum crucibles or a Plattner with his blowpipe, to overvalue the amount of plain honest and sufficient, though merely preliminary, work that was done between the apotheosis of alchemy and the ascension of the phlogistic chemistry.

But that happy, though somewhat meteoric, rise of a new science from the shaken ashes of the old mystery was not long of beginning; for, in the midst of all the gathering and crowding details, wrought out by the post-alchemical craftsmen, a true chemical principle began to gleam. These industrious experimentalists began to understand, once for all, that the act of the burning of a body, or the process of combustion, as it is now called, is a phenomenon of principal significance in chemistry. Perceiving that the interpretation of the burning of a piece of wood, or brimstone, or anything else that is capable of being destroyed or changed by fire, would yield the clew to this whole department of inquiry, namely, to the half-chaotic mass of the chemical discoveries of the period, they invented a theory, or rather a hypothesis of the fictitious sort, capable of rendering the phenomenon of fire intelligible to the mind, but not of explaining it in conformity with the now known reality of things; and it was that memorable hypothesis which constituted or consummated the new movement, and fairly consolidated the second epoch of chemical development. But their doctrine was founded on fact, and it owed all its value to the facts it represented. Notwithstanding the fictitiousness of the point of view, on which they eventually planted themselves, they were eminently practical men. They noticed with learned eye that the process of common combustion concealed one of those central facts, on the elimination of which the progress of science is ever and anon depending. Obedient to the hint of genius, they proceeded to the

generalization of the phenomenon throughout all its known particulars and circumstances. The metals, with the exception of silver and gold, were changed into rusts or calxes, resembling chalk or brick-dust or other colored earthy bodies, when heated high in exposure to the air of the furnace; and this alteration they saw to be identical with what is undergone by brimstone, phosphorus or any common combustible, when it burns with flame. Tin burns with a glow, indeed, which is so like ordinary flame as to have been quite adequate to the suggesting of the rest of the secret;—no secret now-a-days, of course, since we work in metals that take fire when thrown on water, and think nothing of burning iron-wire in oxygen like a wax-match in the air; but a great affair for the early twilight, between the meteors of the alchemical night and the coming sun of positive chemistry, in which it was first made. It was thus, then, that the whole science, such as it was in the first watch of the post-mediæval morning of its now broad day, was divided into distinguishable parts:—the study of bodies before combustion, and that of the same bodies after that great cosmical process. This division of chemical objects implied, as a matter of course, the study of the act of combustion itself. Unburned matter was the thesis, burned matter the antithesis, and the process of burning the mesothesis, of the new logic of chemistry. The matters were as various as nature could afford; they already knew a large number of substances, and undoubtedly anticipated the acquisition of many more: but the process was one and indivisible.

Even this dividing of all the species of matter then known into these two great classes, the burned and the unburned, was most important for the wants of the period; and it is now well understood to have been founded in truth. In a larger sense, it is as true to-day as it was then, that all mineral substances are either combustibles or ashes; and in the smaller sense of those grandfathers of ours, namely, in that of every inorganic matter being either a combustible or an atmospheric ash (that is, an oxide) it is still correct, in so far as the immense majority of natural bodies are concerned. The chemistry of that time was therefore brought into intelligible order by the generalization in question; and all the facts, of which its body then consisted, were thereby made to revolve round one great phenomenon as their common centre. In short, similar things were put together, in spite of their apparent dissimilarity; and dissimilar things were put asunder, notwithstanding their superficial resemblances; and a genuine reformation was

begun, all with a degree of sagacity far more than equal to the task in hand. But it has already been hinted that those venerable chemists were by no means satisfied with the perception and exposition of the analogy that subsists between the metallic calxes and the acids, nor yet with their new classification of material forms. They advanced, without the infirmity of a doubt, to the explication of the phenomenon of fire itself, that one and universal agent of their chemical transformations. Nor was an interpretation, say rather a figment or a hypothesis, far to seek. The fiction, that fire is a substantial, though subtle, material element of nature, had been promulgated by Empedocles more than four centuries before the coming of Christ: handed down to the polypharmacists, it had played but a small figure in their doctrine; brought to Europe once more, the alchemists had written not a little about it and about it, while they had made nothing of it whatever as a theoretic centre: but now it was destined to quicken the whole mass of a growing chemistry, and to give that unity to all its parts, of which they stood more in need than ever. In fine, the ancient Greek, if not Egyptian, matter of fire, the empyrean element of the old quaternion, was at length recognised, set apart and consecrated by the hierophants of a young European science under the classical name and style of Phlogiston!

Not to trace the hypothesis embodied in that long-lived word with historical accuracy from chemist to chemist, or even from time to time of its existence as a scientific power, let us look at it as an epochal whole before proceeding to the consideration of the positive chemistry of Lavoisier and his more manly school.

A lighted candle burns till it is done, giving out flame or matter of fire all the while:—for what reason, but because a candle is a compound of candle-matter and phlogiston, because that compound is decomposed when it burns, and because phlogiston is thereby set free and shews itself in the flame from the beginning to the end of the process? The pure dephlogisticated candle-matter is also liberated, of course, little by little as the taper burns from top to socket; that candle-matter turning out to be carbonic acid gas and water, as discovered by later methods of research: so that, according to the phlogistic chemistry, tallow should have been tabulated as a compound of fire with water and fixed air. Counting the ashes of the wick and oil, this was neither more nor less than the experiment of the Greek physiologists after all:—phlogiston or fire, carbonic acid or air, moisture or water, and

ashes or earth! But our cunning and well-appointed chemists, as has been said above, generalized the idea all over the enlarging science. A stick of brimstone burns away with a blue flame and a suffocating vapour, and the residue of its combustion is the sulphurous acid: in the language of the phlogistians, brimstone is a compound of two things, sulphurous acid and phlogiston; and, when it is suffered to burn, it gives out its phlogiston or flame of fire, and there remains its dephlogisticated sulphur, or sulphurous acid, in the separated state. Phosphorus contains, according to the exploded hypothesis, a white deliquescent acid and phlogiston; and that so loosely united as to be kindled or decomposed by a little friction, or by a slight elevation of its temperature: being burned, it sheds its phlogiston and the phosphoric acid is reproduced. This school also regarded the metals as compound bodies: each metal was supposed to consist of its own rust or calx and the all-embracing phlogiston; and, when any metal was burnt to a calx in the fire or before the blowpipe, it was considered to have given out its fiery principle, and its ashes or rust remained. Iron was composed of iron-rust and fire, in the scientific theory of those speculators; dephlogisticate it, that is, burn it to a cinder, and you have the rust. Hence some bodies, such as wood, coal and especially charcoal, which give out much heat and leave apparently little dephlogisticated matter when burnt, were viewed as substances overcharged with phlogiston, and therefore capable of imparting it largely to others. Now it always was, as it still is, desirable to transform ores, such as the iron-rust in the various iron-stones, into reguline metals, such as iron; and it has long been understood that the best way of doing so, in the majority of common instances, consists in mingling those ores with carbon in some form or other and then heating them in the furnace; a thing but too easily explained by the fiction under consideration, for the carbon had only to pour its phlogiston into the ores, and thereby to convert them to metallic natures, solid and bright! In the substance of silver and gold, however, the fire was so compacted and inherent that nothing could take it out of them; and thence their fixity in the furnace, under all ordinary circumstances: other metals were dephlogisticated or turned to mere calxes, their metallic nature quite gone when heated to redness or melted in the air; but the royal pair remained intact under the fiercest trial, and that constituted their royalty then, as it is one of the conditions of their value now. Even when their calxes were stealthily made by precipitation from

the solutions of these noble metals, in the nitric and the nitro-muriatic acids respectively (the strong and the royal waters of a bye-gone terminology), the least elevation of temperature, even the action of light in some circumstances, or the mere contact of some highly phlogisticated substance, at once enabled them to snatch back their appropriate portions of phlogiston, and thereupon to become silver and gold again!

It might readily have occurred to an ingenious student of those days to inquire into the fortunes of phlogiston, when once liberated from a metal or a combustible: for, after the combustion of a piece of phosphorus, for example, the phosphoric acid remained and could be bottled up as a specimen of one of the supposed ingredients of that kind of matter; but what came of the fiery principle? where did the flame go to? was it merely seen for a moment and then lost? could it not be caught and kept like the acid? The opinion of the ancients seems to have been that it ascended right to the empyrean, that boundless space of pure fire which was supposed to inclose the air as the air inclosed the earth and the water of their universe; but, in the view of the phlogistians, it was no sooner liberated from a combustible than it passed into combination with the surrounding atmosphere, coming forth from the latent state of combination only to be devoured by the air, born only to die again! It could not, indeed, be emancipated from its union with one body unless another were ready to take it in without delay: fire was the momentaneous glance of phlogiston in its passage from one engagement to another; and thence the necessity of air to common fire, or else of some other atmosphere to the process of combustion in its more exceptional forms. It was, therefore, in connexion with this way of thinking concerning flame (and respiration at a later period) that Priestley, when he discovered oxygen, one of the constituents of our mingled atmosphere, supposed it to be air deprived of that phlogiston which fire-places and lungs appeared to be continually pouring into it, and he called it dephlogisticated air.

Among the difficulties which stood in the way of poor phlogiston, there was one which it needed both ingenuity and hardihood to surmount. It had been early observed (especially by Jean Rey, whose name deserves honourable mention as the unwitting herald of Lavoisier) that certain metals were heavier after than before calcification: ten grains or ounces of lead weighed more than ten after having been burned to a calx; whereas they ought to have weighed less, if

phlogiston were really a material substance. Lead, supposed a compound body, gave off one of its ingredients, phlogiston, becoming thereby the mere calx of lead; and yet that calx was heavier than the original lead. Whereupon the friends of phlogiston discovered that it was the one exceptional substance, and possessed of the unique property of positive levity; so that what body soever it entered into union with, such as lead-calx, straightway became lighter than it was before such addition to its substance! Air and smoke had formerly been supposed to be positively light, until Torricelli shewed that they rise, not because of their greater levity, but on account of their less density; and it is curious to consider that the popular mind, as well as the young or half-taught individual intellect, resembles the earlier historic spirit in this particular, and is invariably prone to the conception of cold, darkness, and other undeniable privatives or minors, as positive things. It is easy to smile at such mistakes now-a-days, with all those accumulated advantages to which the present age has been promoted by the labours of the very men who made them; but it is difficult to realize the position and the attitude of their minds. To do the former requires only a little information and flippancy; while the latter demands knowledge, reverence and imagination. It would be as ridiculous as it is impossible, of course, for the investigators of the nineteenth century to go back to the ways of thinking (not to mention the opinions and attainments) in science of the mediæval or the transitional period: but it were desirable to study the circumstances and the psychological direction of the times, together with the particular misconceptions and hypotheses which prevailed in them; for it is probable, if not certain, that similar errors, both in method and in matter, predominate in those departments of our own science, which have not yet lifted themselves entirely out of the limbo of fiction.

The singular evasion of the question of weight, frank and ready as it was, only introduced another perplexity; but the good old chemists were equal to the new emergency. If the calx of lead, or of any other metal, became lighter in common balance-weight by combining with phlogiston, that subject of a positive levity, how was it that it also became specifically heavier? The calx was a comparatively light sort of stone; the lead, into which it was converted by union with light phlogiston, was a comparatively heavy metal: a cubic inch of the metal was twice as heavy as an inch of the stone. If the particles of an ounce of calx

had buoys of fire attached to them, so as at once to change them into particles of lead and to make them lighter in the aggregate, how should such enlarged and lightened particles produce a metal of so much greater a specific gravity than the unphlogisticated rust! But there lay the secret: these phlogisticated particles of calx were not enlarged, they were only lightened; the fiery particles were not stuck on the calx ones like so many vesicles; they penetrated them, as a sword goes into a scabbard, and then constricted or compressed them, as the earth draws the atmosphere tight about it, so that a greater number of the fire-pierced calcareous particles, thereby rendered metallic, packed into the same space, and therefore the metal was specifically heavier, though absolutely lighter, than the calx from which it was made!

How catholic, elastic and satisfactory this venerable hypothesis must have been! It was all wrong, indeed, as a substantive doctrine. In one particular, it was a sort of reverse of the truth. It is not the calxes and acids that are simple: it is not the combustibles and metals that are compound: it is exactly the reverse. Sulphur, phosphorus, carbon and the combustibles, on one hand, with lead, iron and the metals on the other, are elementary: the respective acids and calxes of these principles are the compounds. The phlogistians may therefore be said to have perceived the relation subsisting between these two classes of bodies upside-down, like the figures in a *Camera Obscura*; and surely their chamber was obscure enough, all honour to the light they managed to cast into it from the depths of their own minds. The images of things are painted on the nervous receiving-sheet inside the eyeball in the same fashion, namely, in the inverted position; but there is some cunning principle of rectification, whether in or beyond the retina, whereby those images are put on their feet again before presentation to the perception of the indwelling mind. Now this correcting power was wanting in the intellectual organ of the phlogistic schoolmen; their interior eye had probably not been sufficiently educated to the unsophisticated perception of outward truth by the cruel experience of their predecessors; and they consequently suffered that we might learn, not only to look exclusively at nature, but also to see things as they are. Their cogitative energy was still, in fact, greater than their perceptive capacity; as had been more and more signally the case with their three races of predecessors, the alchemists, the polypharmacists, and the physiological school

of the ancient Greek movement in philosophy. Nobody who knows anything of Beccher and Stahl, for example, can doubt that they were the equals of Lavoisier and Dalton in all intellectual respects, excepting that Christian virtue of sacrificing the intellect itself on the altar of observation, while they were certainly their superiors in extent of culture and in aspiration. Assuredly this phlogiston of theirs was nothing but an *Idolum Specūs*, a figure cast upon the imagination from the phosphorescent walls of that cavernous part of the history of chemistry which they were traversing, but it was an image worthy of admiration and reverence. As to the generic idea of it, erroneous though it was and is, it is extant in the science yet; for it is impossible to see wherein that of Caloric differs from it as a scientific conception, although elaborated with immensely greater precision, except that caloric is the matter of heat while phlogiston was the matter of fire. Both phlogiston and caloric are substances which have no existence whatever in the external world; they have both been the convenient, though fictitious representatives of natural realities, and they have both been eminently useful in standing for certain phenomena in their several days: but the latter creature of the materializing tendency of unripe science is not a whit better in essence than the former. Then as for the application of the phlogistic dogma to the details of chemistry, that was certainly wide of the mark, yet it glanced by the fact of the case in a remarkable manner: the doctrine was little short of being the half of the actual truth. It kept the calxes together, and the known acids too, as all so many analogons; so that, when Lavoisier arrived and discovered the composition of the mercurial calx, the remainder of his task was done to his hand, and all the other rusts and acids followed the oxide of quicksilver by a natural and easy consequence. Moreover, when Davy came on the scene, the classification of our phlogistians, as extended and enhanced by the great discovery grafted on it by the French chemistry, pointed not doubtfully to the alkalis and earths as being probably nothing but the rusts or oxides of metals difficult of separation from their ores; whereupon, with the help of electrolysis, he made the brilliant discovery of potassium and the other easily combustible metals. To sum up the whole matter, this phlogiston prepared the way for the balance, just as the balance heralded the Daltonian arithmetic of chemistry: it had done the gigantic task of putting the enormous huddle of known

facts into order; and there they stood, awaiting the renovated eye of science in the person of Lavoisier.

It also served as a centre of coherence for the thoughts and new attempts of a race of splendid thinkers and industrious workmen, from Stahl down to Cavendish. But for phlogiston, less than half-truth though it was, the science of these clear-headed and adventurous men would have been but a crude heap, instead of an intimate and seemingly combination of details; a mingling of all sorts of observations, not a melting of them into one substance; a clumsy pudding-stone, or at best a somewhat confused granite, not a clear and many-crystalled quartz; a chaos of the senses, and not a creation of the mind. A great half-truth will be found at the core of the Lavoisierian, at the heart of the Daltonian, chemistries too; for man, at least considered as chemist, is destined to advance by a succession of oblique steps, forward yet ever somewhat aside, for many a time to come; and the sooner he becomes aware of the fact the better. Not till then, at all events, shall he be able to show forth a childlike faith in the past, a manly contentment with the present, and a ripened trust in the future of science and of all generous endeavour. Not till then will he feel the succeeding æons of his vast existence, in every part of history, to be the onflowing of one river, the growing of one tree of life, or the rising as of one human being from infancy to age. The last of these is the truest image, in fact, that could be used. The playful and apparently successful childhood of chemistry may be said to have passed among those young-souled Greeks, from whom phlogiston came down: they asked such profound questions at Nature that they could not understand her motherly responses, yet the very putting of those questions foreshadowed the whole history of the science. Its busy but little-doing boyhood was spent in the East, under caliphs and physicians, whose very names are fragrant with romance: its ardent and imaginative pubescence, in the unbroken Christendom of the middle ages, amid the hum of scholasticism and under the shadow of Gothic architecture: and we have just seen something of its sturdy youth of somewhat positive effort during the reign of phlogiston. The fifth of its ages, that of victorious and self-confident manhood, now offers itself to the attention of the historical student: but it will be a relief to the strain of chemical discussion, to put in a few words about the men whose names are associated with the memory of the matter of fire, be-

fore proceeding to that still more remarkable epoch.

If phlogiston was not formally enunciated, or invented and applied in all its breadth, it was at all events announced in an intelligible manner by Joachim Becher; a man of an eccentric and keen spirit, a scholar of liberal cultivation, and a wanderer upon the face of the earth. Little that is certain can be said about the particulars of his outward life. He was born at Spire in 1635, was chief doctor to the electors of Mayence and Bavaria in succession, and subsequently the object of a world of persecution, although under the auspices of the Emperor. One cannot know how much or how little he may have drawn the enmity of his contemporaries upon him by defiance and waywardness; and it is certainly interesting to observe how frequently the Galileos, Keplers and Hahnemanns of scientific history have been much to blame for the harsh entertainment they have received at the hands of a world, that is as impatient of disdain as it is placable by submission. It is not easy to avoid the suspicion that he must have been but a 'discomfortable cousin' at the best, and perhaps he drew untold comfort and self-reliance from the fact. Be that as it may, he was pursued with the utmost rigour of both the civil and the lynch law of his day, and had to betake himself to flight and expatriation. He fled first to Holland and afterwards to England, but both his travels in exile and his latter end are now lost in obscurity. Dumas avers that the envy of courtiers, and the persecution he everywhere brought on himself by his intolerable vanity, made him the most wretched of men; but even inordinate self-assertion, still more that over-valiant self-trust which is easily mistaken by the vain for the insolence of pride, is not without its secret joy, with which no stranger can intermeddle. It is therefore not inconceivable though surprising that, notwithstanding his erratic and peaceless career, he wrote largely on theology, politics, history, philology, mathematics and chemistry. In one of his chemical pieces, he describes an excellent portable furnace, full of little contrivances, and handy enough in its way; and it is to be inferred that there was a practical turn in the midst of his multifarious speculative tendencies. He was even more fiercely anti-scholastic than his turbulent predecessor, the raging Paracelsus himself. Standing out for the rights of experiment, he rejected the four elements, as well as the quintessence, fifth element or first matter of the later alchemists; but he did so only to promulgate

four elements of his own, namely, fire, the earthy principle, the combustible element and the metallic one. The foundation of his chemical doctrine, in fact, was just a classification of material substances into fiery or imponderable bodies, earths, combustibles and metals. The latter two kinds of matter being subsequently understood to be analogous in so far as combustibility is concerned, this division was still further simplified. Fire was then the first kind of substance; earths, calxes and acids were the second; and combustibles, including both the metals and the common acid-yielding combustibles, such as brimstone and phosphorus, formed the third: fire, the products of combustion, and combustibles eventually constituting the logical triad of that chemistry which arose out of the protest and new classification of this singular reformer; and it is needless to shew how true and invaluable all this was, always deducting the materialization of fire—a thing with which, by the way, the science of this age should kindly sympathize, for it still abounds in materializations of the same sort. His great work was, let us rather say is, the *Physica Subterranea*, of which only one part remains. It is dedicated to the Almighty Compounder in a queer, familiar yet striking style, leaving the sympathetic reader in doubt as to whether it is *impious*, or merely *impious*, or actually though fantastically *pius*. It is true, to be sure, that Van Helmont inscribed his works to Jehovah in a strain, which is as devout as it is foreign to the taste, if not to the spirit, of the present day. It were a becoming consecration, indeed, to put upon every grave production: but it ought to be written all over the book, and not only at the beginning or the end; and it should surely be done in invisible and sympathetic lines, so that only the warm and understanding heart of the reader should be able to bring them out on the unostentatious page, and that for no eye but his own.

George Ernest Stahl, the elaborator of the phlogistic hypothesis, was inspired with his thought by the works of this uneasy Beccher. He adored the *Physica Subterranea* more especially. He calls it *Opus sine Parâ*, a work without a peer, *Primum ac Princeps*, first and foremost, *Liber undique et undique Primus*, a book everywhere and everywhere supreme—and so forth. Born at Anspach in 1660, twenty-five years after his master or intellectual sire, he was a physician, and a first-physician to dukes and kings, in Saxe-Weimar and at Berlin, till he died in 1734. His medical as well as his chemical works approve him a man

of deep and wide views, or attempts to understand those parts of nature to which he belonged; and it is well known that he is an important figure in the history of European medicine, while the Homœopathists of this contentious time of transition claim him as one of the forerunners or outriders of their hierophant. He was born a methodologist, and there lay his strength. His extensive information, gathered from many quarters, grew easily into a system within his mind. By nature and by cultivation he was an unrestrainable system-builder; and, happily, his method, or principle of unity, was a good one for his sort of studies, especially for the chemistry of that day, which lay waiting for reduction to order after its agitation by the rough-handed Joachim of Spire. There was the particular work to do, here was the very man to do it; and it was done. Under the influence of poor Paracelsus, as well as of his more immediate exemplar, he was an experimentalist as well as a dogmatist, an advocate for experience as well as for thought, a man of facts as well as of ideas. In short, the theory of chemistry, which has just been explained at some length, was mainly the result of his observative meditation; and it is unnecessary to add anything to that explanation, until the movement against it under the conduct of Lavoisier comes to be considered.

If Beccher was odd as well as original in his way of thinking, Stahl was certainly original as well as odd in his way of writing. His style is the strangest motley. It is half Latin and half German. This cannot have been owing to ignorance, for he was a learned man, and had more than enough Latin for his purposes. Neither is it to be rashly attributed to indolence or carelessness, for he was an industrious and painstaking chemist and physician. Certes, neither ignorance nor laziness were amongst his defects. Can it have been the sheer wilfulness of a Titanic and intellectually licentious spirit, like that of his elephantine and sportive countryman Richter in later times? Was there any inward necessity, of a personal and psychological kind, for this fantastic coat of many colours, in which he could not but invest his new thoughts, as seems to be the case of our own Carlyle? Or may it not have been a determined will to introduce, to the extent that he could, the writing of scientific works in the vernacular speech? Let our admiration and gratitude prevail with us to suppose that the last of these is the true explanation of this ludicrous characteristic of his, for in that case he would have one claim more on our regard; a claim which should have peculiar force in a

popular dissertation like this, for it is clear that science could never have been discussed before the unprofessional reader, until good German and English had been substituted in our books for bad Latin. Since, then, Doctor Stahl may really be considered as one of the tutelary geniuses of scientific literature, the concluding words of his five folios on the Foundations of Chemistry cannot be without some interest in the present connexion. It is impossible to exhibit the grotesque effect of the mixture of Latin and German, with a sprinkling of Greek, in a translation; but the impatient etceteras are faithfully taken from the text, and they will convey some impression of the glorious absurdity of the original. The recipe of the folio is this—three parts of good Dog-latin, two of German, one of Etceteras, and a dash of new Greek, to say nothing particular about a pinch of Arabic.

‘As for the use of these things, both for science (that is, the excessive delectation and the cultivation of the mind,) and for purposes which are physical, economical, civil, &c., all that has been said is worthy, &c.:—I advise my noble readers to ruminate over what has been said, &c. But I warn them altogether against those meteoric studies, and vain promisings, opinions, speculations, for fear their mind should ruin their conscience, fame, time, faculty, &c. Wherefore I warn them away from that vulgarly so-called alchemy and its foolish hopes, for it were surely absurd to hope that God would make a man rich because he has made him wise: and as for doing good with it, that is mere knavery to be spit upon. Our Lord God wishes to have the poor and the rich together, although he could soon make us all rich. Morrhosius, in his epistle concerning transmutation, which is certainly worth reading, for it contains some excellent things, tells how Kelly the Englishman got a certain tincture in a wonderful manner, namely, on condition that he should dower poor virgins with it; but while he toyed with it, and wished to see if he really knew the craft of the thing, he actually wasted it all in trials; and there happened to him one of those fates, whereof we have no examples now-a-days: wherein is to be seen how their own inconsiderate nature and perversity, especially in youth, can bring men to ruin. Well, truly, does God ever deal with us, even while the divine goodness denies us smiles in order to award us wrath, &c.’ So ends the *Fundamenta Chymiae*, and so the world takes its last farewell of alchemy, with the wrath of heaven and an &c.!

science, it was under the illumination and guidance of this Pillar of Fire that there lived, laboured, and prevailed some of the finest spirits that ever devoted their talents to the work of chemistry. Amongst others, whom the particular limitations and the general scope of this short review render it undesirable even to name, there were Scheele of Sweden, Priestley and Cavendish of England, Black and Watt of Scotland, as well as the great Frenchman, Lavoisier himself, at the commencement of his career. To say nothing of the modest and secluded Scheele’s discovery of new solid and liquid bodies of every kind, it was these men who began and carried forward that pneumatic chemistry, or chemistry of the gases, which has done so much for the arts of life, which has also been incidental to the transformation of the science, and into which it is now necessary to look, both because it arose among the phlogistians, and because it led to that memorable expansion of modern chemistry about to be described as the epoch of Lavoisier.

It was long till the vital air was clearly understood to be a substance essentially similar to the earth and the sea; and there is little wonder that it should not, it is so thin, transparent, evanescent, invisible and mysterious. The result of the earliest thoughts of mankind on the subject, in so far as these are embodied in the young languages of the world, seems always to imply some supposed analogy between the impalpable breath of the physical heavens and the inscrutable spirit of God himself. The winds were *Æolian powers*, or rather potentates, passing through the omnipresent sea of life, now rushing with demoniacal hurry athwart the scene, and now gently stirring it like the breath of angels. The very word *Spirit*, in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, is significant of breath. It appears that the force of inspiration, or the coming of god or demon into an ecstatic person, is expressed by the word *Wareen*, the winds, in Hindostan; and the very name cannot but remind one of the divine *Aura* of the ancient Romans, the sacred breeze of poetic or prophetic rapture. Let facts of this sort be the indications, either that the mind of man in history has ascended step by step from material towards spiritual conceptions; or, contrariwise, that he has come down from a primeval life of ideas into that of nature and the senses, until he has lost the idea in the symbol, and thereby become materialized: there is one conclusion that remains the same in either case, namely, that it was only in comparatively modern times that the truly crass and unreservedly

In addition to these two patriarchs of the

material nature even of atmospheric air, not to mention the other (long unknown) gases, was plainly recognised. Nor has the ærial ocean, in which we are submerged, ceased to be the inalienable symbol of whatever is spiritual and divine, even now that we know all about it. It is still the appropriate type for the inflowing of the Catholic spirit into the private soul of the saint, although its soft and secret substance has been weighed in the balance, solidified in many a tangible compound, and made out of stones by the hands of art. Notwithstanding all our experiments, fixations and recoveries, it is just as beautiful, as mysterious, and as necessary to life as ever; for science does not destroy the poetical or the spiritual significancy of nature at all, it only removes it to a greater depth. 'Thou canst not tell whence it cometh, nor whither it goeth.'

Galileo was the first to form something like a right conception of the ponderous character of the atmosphere. It had been found, during the erection of certain public works by the then reigning Grand-duke of Tuscany, that water could not be drawn up a pump any higher than some two-and-thirty feet. The piston having been raised towards the upper end of a tall pump, the water followed with due fidelity so far, but it would not budge beyond a certain height. The schoolmen of that day had found an easy explanation of the rise of water in pumps, when the pistons are drawn up, in the famous proposition, or rather figure of speech, that Nature abhors a void:—the air tight piston being elevated, an empty space is left between the surface of the water and the piston, and therefore the water goes up to fill it without a sensible instant of delay. But they had now to mend their maxim, because it appeared that Nature did not unreservedly and implacably abhor a void after all; inasmuch as even water, the very type of mobility and obedience, would not follow the piston an inch above its own particular point of choice:—and they were thereby driven from the ineffectual, but not unpoetical, mysticism of their fathers to something like sophistication, for they were fain to assert that she abhors it only to the height of ten yards or so! It is never the originators of a great but useful scientific error, nor yet its true and industrious believers, but its indolent perpetuators who will not move to the music of the new fact and the new time, that are ridiculous, shifty, ambiguous, and not respectable.

The case was now put to the discoverer of the satellites of Jupiter, and he seems to

have seen into the secret at once. It was reserved, however, for his pupil Torricelli to establish and work out his ready conjecture. The celebrated Pascal repeated, verified, and extended Torricelli's experiments. The truth of the thing, in brief, was and is just this:—air, though comparatively light, is positively heavy, having a weight of its own. The experiments of these men showed that a square inch of it, carried up from the surface of the earth to the top of the atmosphere, is no less than 15 lbs. in weight. It is this weight of the atmosphere, 15 lbs. on every square inch, that pushes water into the void left by the updrawn piston of a pump; and there is, of course, a limit beyond which it cannot push the water, namely, the point of height at which the column of water in the pump-tube is exactly balanced by the weight of the atmosphere. It is just a question of balance; 15 lbs. can support only 15 lbs.,—a thing which every body understands now-a-days, thanks to Galileo, Torricelli and Blaise Pascal, the seer, the discoverer and the verifier of the fact.

In the time of Van Helmont, who flourished at the beginning of the seventeenth century, the workmen in certain German mines were molested, just as our colliers still are, by poisonous choke-damp and explosive fire-damp; that is to say, (for the words were German, though only too easily domesticated in England), by suffocating and by fiery vapours, the former of which put out life silently but summarily, while the latter might blow its unfortunate victims to pieces. In sarcastic playfulness with the popular superstition regarding these guardians of the mineral treasures of the old earth, that singular man imposed upon them the name of ghosts or gases; but it must be confessed that he knew little or nothing positive about them. Boyle was probably the first to suspect that some solid bodies do in certain circumstances, when they are heated for instance, throw off artificial airs resembling the common atmospheric gas in thinness and in elasticity, as well as in dryness and permanency, but differing from it he could not well tell how. It is related of Hoffman, that he got himself into much trouble with the ecclesiastics of his place and time, who embittered his latter days not a little on account of his physical criticisms, by averring that the spirits by whom certain foolish students, addicted to midnight magical incantations over chaufers glowing within chalk-drawn circles and pentagrams, had been seduced, frightened, floored, otherwise maltreated, and hardly suffered to escape

with their beggarly lives, were undoubtedly evil spirits or caco-demons, as they had been pronounced by a respectable bench of theological judges,—but the spirit of avarice to begin with, and the spirit of charcoal to carry on the process!

It was young Black, however, the greatest chemist Scotland has produced, and the discoverer of that fact of latent heat which Watt has embodied in the steam-engine, that took the first positively chemical step in this progress. He discovered that limestone (or chalk or marble or oyster-shell,) when burned in the kiln and thereby rendered quick, parts with a kind of air in which no animal can breathe and live; and also that it is owing to its setting free this air or gas that the change from inactive limestone to caustic quicklime is due. He called it fixed air, imprisoned in the rock till the furnace or oil of vitriol or the spirit of salt extricated it from its fixture. He perceived and proved that this fixed air was neither more nor less than of the nature of an acid, but existing, alone of all acids, in the airy or gaseous state; not in the liquid or solid one, as was common and world-like. Thus was the fertile conception that there may exist many different kinds of airy matter, just as there are many kinds of solid and liquid substances, differing as much from the gas of the atmosphere as the vitriolic oil or the fuming liquor of Libavius or the essence of turpentine differs from the waters of the ocean, or as marble differs from sandstone, and sandstone from alabaster, fairly inaugurated. It was a magnificent discovery, and it was made at Edinburgh almost within the memory of its present inhabitants. The late venerable Lord Glenlee, who had been the companion of Black, Hutton, Robertson, Adam Smith and all the intellectual magnates of old Edinburgh, once described to us the sensation it excited amongst the learned of that critical city; and it must still be avowed that it is the greatest discovery in natural science that has ever been made there. We also remember a conversation with Doctor Chalmers, who retained his generous love of science to the last concerning this chemistry of the gases. Flinging himself back into the last century, after having condescended on the latest improvements in organic analysis, he exclaimed,—‘Yes, it is all very beautiful; but think of Black catching fixed air, and discerning it to be an acid, at a time when nobody thought of such things: that was the great stroke; it was a very great thing to do.’ Yes, be the orator’s judgment re-echoed now, for it is the first step that is ever the heroic step.

It has to be taken in the dark, it has to be taken alone, it can be taken only by a man who is capable of taking all the past along with him, and it cannot be taken by him on whom the bounded present has already crystallized, changing him to a pillar of salt.

Soon after this initiative had been taken by Joseph Black, Priestley invented an easy way of collecting and handling gaseous bodies, the pneumatic trough with its jars, and actually came upon some nine kinds of gas (all differing from ordinary air and from one another) in the course of a few busy and even stormy years,—for poor Priestley was as restless a controversialist in theology and philosophy as ever Beecher or any of the alchemists had been, and had to undergo a world of trouble in connexion with his disputatious career. Scheele had meanwhile been making conquests of the same sort in an obscure Swedish town, with no apparatus but phials and bladders, and had added two or three more to the list of new gases. All Europe followed these sagacious leaders, Cavendish the discoverer of hydrogen, Watt who first suspected water to be composed of two gases, Rutherford the discoverer of nitrogen, Lavoisier the interpreter though not the first discoverer of oxygen, and the rest; until everybody has at length become aware that gases are just the steams of liquids which boil at immensely low points of temperature, these liquids being the liquefactions of solid bodies which melt at temperatures lower still, and that therefore there may be no end to the number of the kinds of gaseous matter, precisely as there is no known limit to the vast variety of liquids and solids. One species, or rather a variable mixture of two or three, composed of carbon and hydrogen, is made in the outskirts of nearly every town nowadays in enormous quantities, and then sent away from a huge Priestleyan trough and jar, as from a heart, to circulate through a system of metallic arteries for the purpose of lighting the houses of the rich, the chambers of the poor and the halls of the public, the incredulity of Walter Scott notwithstanding. Hoffman’s spirit of charcoal, the fixed air of Black, the carbonic acid of the present nomenclature, is studiously crushed into bottles of soda-water by stout machinery, to be quaffed by the luxurious and the ailing before it has time to fly away. Our cottons and linens are bleached by chlorine. Great balloons are filled with the phlogisticated air or hydrogen of Cavendish, the lightest of corporeal bodies, to carry men of science and fools with singular impartiality. Oxygen and hydrogen are separated from chemical union with one

another in water, suffered to remain mechanically mingled, and then made to unite again by combustion at the nozzle of the oxy-hydrogen blow-pipe, so as to produce a number of useful and beautiful results. The arsenic that may lurk about the putrid remains of a dead and buried man is transformed by an easy process into arseniuretted hydrogen gas, so as by its decomposition to bring the metal that laid him low before the eye of a jury. The spirit of hartshorn is now understood to be but a compound of nitrogen and hydrogen, called ammonia, absorbed and probably in combination with water; while the old spirit of salt or muriatic acid, is just an aqueous solution of hydrochloric gas; and the knowledge of these things is daily made use of in the manufacture of those indispensable liquors. The nitrogen is seduced into something like an unwilling chemical union with the oxygen of the atmosphere, by a device borrowed from nature, so as to yield the nitrate of lime, the nitrate of potassa or salt-petre, the nitrate of soda, and (by a secondary process) the nitric acid or nitrate of water itself, that invaluable oxydant and solvent of the metallurgist and the chemist. Hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen and chlorine, the four gaseous elements now known, (to say nothing of fluorine, which is doubtless destined to be proved a true gas) and a great number of gaseous compounds of these simple airs with one another, and with both liquid and solid kinds of matter, are not only daily prepared with certainty and precision, but hourly transferred from combination to combination, in the operations of the manufactory and the laboratory. In fact, there is no end to the applications of this pneumatic chemistry, which took its rise within the (old) college of Edinburgh from the mind of a student of medicine, who had been faithfully brought up in the Stahlian creed by Dr. Cullen, at once his preceptor and his disciple. The chemistry of the gases, in truth, is one of several achievements which unite to throw something like an imaginative lustre around those crowds of nomadic young men, who yearly congregate in the metropolis of Scotland for the study of physick. Within the indefinite circumstances and the questionable appearance of the student of any current session, there may be working and striving towards effective utterance some conception, which will one day raise him to the companionship of the accomplished and much accomplishing, though mild, retiring and delicate Joseph Black, who lived as fine a life of science as was ever lived, and died with a cup of milk unspilt in his hand.

But neither the multifarious applications of the pneumatic chemistry, nor yet the light it threw on a multitude of natural operations, was its greatest result. Its relation to the growth of the science was still more important than these things. It was nothing less than a critical momentum in the history of chemistry at large. It rendered the existing theory painfully too narrow; the phlogistic hypothesis and classification could not stretch to its demands; the tree began to burst its bark. That admirable phantom phlogiston could not contain, keep in order, and govern all those new discoveries. It was no longer sufficient for its historical purpose. Chemistry was growing too great for its antiquated rule. The very discoveries, which would never have been made but for phlogiston, were turning against it almost as soon as they were made. As is ever the case, his own progeny rose up to devour this Saturn; his own dogs wheeled round on this Actæon to rend him: and the memory of Thales and all the Greeks was now to be done to death for more than age. But the old fellow stood gallantly at bay: and it is notorious that the very men, whose discoveries brought all this tendency to mutiny and revolution about, stood by the falling order of things to the last. Neither Cavendish nor Priestley ever abandoned the matter of fire. True to Empedocles and Stahl, they persisted in conceiving of hydrogen as phlogisticated and of oxygen as dephlogisticated airs respectively, even after the ponderable constitution of water had been suggested by Watt, discovered by Cavendish himself, and completely interpreted by Lavoisier. Cavendish, indeed, gave over chemical investigation in disgust, and betook himself to electricity, as soon as it became clear that the new theory of chemistry had won the day. The restless and hasty, but inventive and generous Priestley in his old age took refuge from his enemies in America; and persevered in the writing of long querulous letters to the Academy at Paris about phlogiston, after it had been taken up by the roots with universal acclamation and consigned to the Hortus Siccus of History. Old doctrines and beliefs are the true mandrakes, many-rooted in the long-trodden soil; and they utter their cries of pain when they are torn up, like those living plants of old and fabulous renown. Alas, the superlative difficulty, and that not only the intellectual, but even more especially the moral difficulty of loosening the mind from the firm-seeming coast of prescriptive and contemporary theory, and of thereupon tempting the untried deep where no credible

land appears to rise, has never been handled with love and justice, whether by poets or historians. More commonly the apostle of the new insults over the senility of the prophet of the old idea:—and yet the New Testament might surely have taught Christendom how to think, feel and speak about every foregoing dispensation. On the other hand, the pain with which an industrious man, whose nature it is to love the past, to revere its great names, to delight in its excellent construction, to cling to its established ways, to take a paternal pride in his own contributions to its citizenship, and, in fine, to embrace it with all the arms of his soul, must feel the island-home of his thoughts and hopes begin to move under his tread as if it were no island, can be altogether understood only by the high-hearted and adventurous mariner, who has pitched his tent on some pleasant, but volcanic and temporary margin the day before its going down again to the deep. To bring this sad reflection to a merry end, however, it must also be confessed that there is a lazy conservative spirit which is as ridiculous and comic as this earnest passion for the good old ways is tragic and far from ignoble. Perhaps the quaintest instance on record of that funny indolence was the case of a worthy professor of chemistry at Aberdeen. He had allowed some years to pass over Davy's brilliant discovery of potassium and its congeneric metals without a word about them in his lectures. At length the learned doctor was conussed by his colleagues on the subject, and he condescended to notice it:—'Both potash and soda are now said to be metallic oxides, said he; the oxides, in fact, of two metals, called potassium and sodium by the discoverer of them, one Davy in London—a verri troublesome person in chemistry.'

It was Antoine Laurent Lavoisier, who first felt the pressure of this necessity for a renovated theory of Chemistry, and at once began to construct it, say rather to woo it from the opening bosom of nature, where it lay ready to come forth at the call of him that knew the word of power. Dumas has triumphantly shown that his countrymen had formed the idea of his great revolution at the very outset of his career, and that even before many of the pneumatic discoveries of the Swedish and British phlogistions had been made and published. There can be no manner of doubt, in fact, of the single-handed originality of the French lawgiver of chemistry in bringing about that transition, from the era of phlogiston and the cupel to that of oxygen and the balance

which constitutes the turning point of the history now under review. It is easy and social to speak with effusion about the division of labour and the grandeur of combination, but it seems generally to be individual men that do the greater business of science and of the world after all. Institutes, academies, royal societies, have all been good; but a man like Lavoisier is better than them all. German, British, American associations have their important purposes to serve, and they subserve them well; but an opinion just begins to prevail, that in these days we run some danger of being associated to death. Excessive association certainly tends to the production of weakness in the individual unit, if the resulting whole is strong; and it is fortunate that there are some men so unsocial as to dwell apart, drawing inspiration from the quiet past, from the instant universe itself, and from the twittering dawn that is ever arising in the east.

Strange to say, although Lavoisier was early an academician, there was not a little of this individuality and isolation in his character, notwithstanding that he did not resemble Stahl so much in this respect as Dalton did,—but he is never to be compared with these epochal men, his sole co-equals in the history of chemistry, in largeness and energy of intellectual structure, while he may be confidently pronounced their superior in lucidity of the understanding. Born at Paris on the 16th of August in 1743, the son of a rich merchant capable of appreciating his child, he was left very much to the guidance of his own intellectual instincts. Having studied mathematics, astronomy, botany, all with some degree of particularity, he at length took lessons in chemistry at the hands of old Rouelle, an odd and extravagant enthusiast who professed the science at Paris in those days. A young man of many talents and accomplishments, the world of science lay all before him and invited his devotion. Circumstances conspired with his peculiar genius to lead him into those chemical recesses or *Physica Subterranea* of nature, into which he was one day to shed a whole atmosphere of light. Dumas mentions with honest pride how, while yet a youth of twenty-two, his hero kept himself six weeks in total darkness, in order to intensify the sensibility of his eye to the perception of faint degrees of luminosity; also how he renounced the solicitations and blandishments of Parisian society for the secluded pursuit of science; and how he put himself on short commons of bread and milk, when he found that the want of air and exercise was going to do him harm.

These are probably things, one might say, which it is more difficult to do in Paris than in London or at Edinburgh, otherwise his countryman and celebrator would scarcely have thought them so notable; yet they do indicate a spirit of quiet self-determination on the part of the young discoverer. It likewise appears that he soon understood the scope of the great task which began to unfold its proportions before him, and he made ready to undertake it with a deal of cool-bloodedness. Perceiving he should need a good income for his purposes, he busied himself to obtain the appointment of a farmer-general of the public revenues. When he succeeded, the chemists said he had forsaken chemistry, and the farmers looked askance upon him as an interloper; but he eventually approved himself the best of farmers and the greatest of the chemists of his day. In timely consolidation of his monetary foundation, he at the same time obtained the hand of the daughter of one of his colleagues in the financial trade, a lady who married Thompson the American, commonly called Count Rumford, after the execution of her immortal Lavoisier.

An academician at twenty-five years of age, he was put at the head of the governmental saltpetre works at thirty-three, during the ministry of Turgot; and, after several other little public dignities had been conferred on him, he was made a member of the famous commission on weights and measures in 1790. The year after this he produced his treatise on the territorial wealth of France, and the Constituent Assembly printed it at the expense of the commonwealth. It moreover seems to be the unanimous verdict of his countrymen, at least in these days, that he behaved himself in a manly and business-like way in all his public capacities, such as they were. But within all this busy and successful outward existence there moved an orb of thought and labour, which was of incalculably more importance to the world. The revenue-farmer was working out a vast scheme of chemical discovery and doctrine all the time. Beginning in 1772, in the course of his thirtieth year, he published some forty memoirs in the *Transactions of the Academy* by 1786, within the space of fifteen years, all of them bearing on his new theory of chemical science. It is also recorded to his honour that, though a rich man, an eminent public character, and a great legislator in science, he engaged in some of the most disgusting of chemical investigations from motives of humanity, thereby adding works of supererogation to those great labours which have given him a name to live for

ever in the history of chemistry and human progress. Take him all in all, he must have been an industrious, devoted, aspiring, public-spirited, virtuous, and really great man; as he was certainly an accomplished man of science and the first of chemists. As a man of intellect he belonged to his city and his age; that is to say, he was a positivist, a disciple of Condillac in philosophy (if philosophy it might be called), a man of the senses and the judgment according to sense, essentially if not formally a materialist, a man of science not a philosopher, analytic and rhetorical rather than a synthesist and a maker, acute not subtle, crystal-clear but not profound. What with his young and demonstrative enthusiasm in pursuit, his intimacy with Laplace and many of the greater men of his day, his liberal public spirit, his perspicacious and sceptical mind, his keen but not ungenial criticism of the past, and his discoveries in physical science, it would be difficult to find a more favourable and substantially excellent example of the kind of man and thinker which the eighteenth century could produce, in France and at Paris, than this our lucid Lavoisier. Yet all his services and all his fine qualities could not save him from the revolutionary scaffold. Upon some paltry accusation of their having authorized or winked at the putting of too much water on the Republic's tobacco, a number of the farmers-general were condemned to death; and the great chemist was one of them. It was in vain that he hid himself in some innermost cabinet of the academy: he was dragged forth like a skulking malefactor, insulted by a mock-trial, and beheaded with the rest of the suspected publicans. It seems now to aggravate this disgusting scene in the historical eyes of Dumas, but it surely relieves its ignominy in so far as the raging populace were concerned at the time, to think that the guillotine swept off the head, not of the crowned and illustrious Lavoisier, but of farmer-general Number Five. The truly pathetic circumstance, connected with this homicide, was the fact that the discoverer was just at the middle of his work, as he supposed. These are the last two sentences he ever wrote:—'This is not the place to enter into any details concerning organized bodies; indeed I have purposely avoided that subject, and that is the reason why I have refrained from speaking of the phenomena of respiration, sanguification, and animal heat. I shall return some day soon to these subjects.' He never returned—in the body; but his spirit, the clear and unmistakable spirit with which he questioned the unknown, the candid and

obedient spirit wherewith he listened for the answer of nature, is with us still, the nobler portion of the legacy he left with his disciples. May it never leave them! While the chemists of the rising generation endeavour to assimilate, in their proper personalities, somewhat of the profound insight into principles of the Greek physiologists, the religious industry of Ghebir and his pharmacologers, the intellectual ambition of Friar Bacon and the alchemists, the inventiveness and method of Stahl and the pneumatic leaders, may they always be strong enough to subordinate those shining qualities to the incorruptible common sense of the great French chemist and his disciples; and, if still newer intellectual manifestations are now about to be evolved with the development of science, may the same principles of common sense accompany chemistry and its explorers, as the ballast of the good ship, for the name of the slaughtered Lavoisier can never cease to be whispered from ear to ear even on the strangest seas.

It is illustrative of his inborn disposition to cope with the greatest questions, as well as of the power of an old idea in a science, that the earliest spontaneous investigation of Lavoisier actually drew its initiative from the dogma of Thales concerning water as the first and fountal element of things. That primitive conception, in truth, had never quite disappeared from the horizon of physics; although water was early reduced to the inferior dignity of being no more than one of four elemental natures as has been explained above. The fountal or generative character of that all-important liquid had been advanced by Van Helmont in later times in connexion with an especial chemical instance. That converted alchemist maintained that water was convertible into earth by prolonged boiling, an opinion, apparently grounded on experiment, which had the continued countenance of Beecher and Stahl. That transcendental element of the old chemistry, in fact, was long-lived and tenacious. The inordinate love of sublimity and unity was not easily extinguished, even in so methodical a spirit as Stahl himself. He retained a provisional region for facts and thoughts beyond the reach of Phlogiston. The belief, or rather the apprehension, of something far more wondrous than metallic calxes and the matter of fire formed the back-ground on which his particular chemical doctrine was painted; and through the visible darkness of that distance there loomed two or three shadowy figures, pointing inwards to some land of promise. These did not interfere with the foreground, but they made it feel unsatisfactory. They

poured a kind of mild and sad contempt upon it. They provoked an undefinable longing in the mind for something they could never give. It therefore behoved the man of a new time, it behoved the young Lavoisier to lay them to rest in one way or another, to settle the questions they suggested once for all, to discover the limits of chemical enquiry, in one word, to understand without mistake the boundaries of his sphere; and, happily, those lingering ghosts remained in such a questionable shape that he could speak to them. He asked not authority, not reason, not imagination; for none of these could tell, and he knew it: he asked Nature if water could or could not be turned into stone, and asked in such a way that she could not but accord an intelligible and also an unmistakable answer. He took an alembic, which may be described as an air-tight still in which the condensed steam or distilled liquor always flows back into the boiler, weighed it, put an ascertained quantity of water into it, made it air-tight, and set the water a-boiling; the steam rising, getting condensed, and trickling back continually through the tubular arms of the pelican. It was kept boiling in this way for a hundred-and-one nights and days, circulating inside the air-tight apparatus. At the end of that period, the whole affair had lost no weight. The pelican or alembic had lost seventeen grains. The water had gained weight, and it was muddy with earthy particles. When this mudded water was evaporated to dryness there remained 20 grains of earth, 17 grains of which had clearly been worn out of the substance of the vessel; but where had the other 3 grains come from? Lavoisier at once assigned them to the incidental errors of experiment, and he does appear to have been wonderfully easily satisfied on the point; for surely an error of three grains in twenty was too large to be overlooked in an attempt to solve so great and venerable a question. The fact is that the three odd grains came from the water itself, the original water doubtless containing that amount of saline and organic matter in solution. But this experimentalist was right in the main, and the earth, which Van Helmont and Beecher traced to the transformation of water, was thus discovered to have come from the earthy vessel in which the water had been pertinaciously boiled. Scheele investigated this very question in another manner; he analyzed the earth produced, and found it to be the same as the stuff of the apparatus. The experiments of the French and Swedish chemists, taken together told with fatal effect. The day of

scepticism had come at last, for chemistry was growing great enough to fill the imagination without the help of transcendental dogma, and the new students were merciless experimenters.

The notable circumstances in this experiment of Lavoisier, as has been pointedly urged by Dumas, is the use of the balance. Till this weighing of the alembic, the water and the residue, the balance had not been used in chemistry as an implement of research; even Scheele had an eye only to the quality, not at all to the quantity, of the earthy matter, when he made his analysis or rather his testing of it. We have already seen how the phlogistians conceived and taught that, when a calx united with a quantity of phlogiston, it had lightness added to it, not weight, and therefore the resultant metal was not so heavy as the original calx. In fact then, so long as phlogiston, assumed to be the principal agent in chemical operation, was supposed to be even lighter than nothing, the balance could not possibly be introduced into chemistry as an instrument of investigation. Accordingly, when Lavoisier ordered a fine balance to be made with a view to its employment in research, the fate of phlogiston was sealed. The very thought of the balance implied the perception, by him who first thought of it, of the central idea of all positive chemistry, namely, that every chemical operation ends in an equation; if 100 grains, ounces or pounds of any substance whatsoever are burned, distilled, or in any way altered by a chemical process, then 100 pounds, ounces or grains of material must be accounted for after the operation; if 100 grains or hundred-weights of wood are consumed by fire, the 100 must be found, when all is done, in the ashes, the water and the carbonic acid resulting from the combustion, for nothing is ever lost. Weight was, for this intelligent and resolute stranger on the arena of chemistry, an immutable thing in nature. He saw without a doubt that the opposite of gravity, namely, the levity of the schoolmen, was a mere negation; a relative term, not a positive reality; a no, not a yes. This original perception, or first act of insight, was the starting-point of his career. It was the first-fruit of his happy genius; and, thank heaven, there were also vouchsafed to him industry, courage, talent and wealth, sufficient for its fulfilment and elaboration: he had not to teach a day-school, attended by scrubby little boys with bare feet and with satchels on their backs, like Dalton during a considerable part of his life; and therefore he was comparatively rapid in his progress, although he had to work and write during not a few years be-

fore he was either listened to or understood—a kind of thing which posterity always likes to forget.

After what has been mentioned, it is easy to understand how Lavoisier should have communicated the following note to the Academy so early as the 1st November 1772, when only in his thirtieth year, before the discovery of oxygen gas, and before the full development of chemical pneumatics, which has been sketched above:—‘I have lately discovered that where sulphur is burned there is produced an acid with increase of weight; and it is the same with phosphorus. That increase of weight comes from the fixation of a prodigious quantity of air. If the metals also, when calcined, increase in weight, it is just from a similar fixation of air, and I can prove it by experiment. In fact, if I take a metallic calx and heat it with carbon in shut vessels, then at the moment when the calx is reduced to the metallic state,—at the moment, for example, when litharge, (the calx of lead) is changed into metallic lead, there reappears the air which had become fixed when the metallic lead had previously been made into a calx, and you may collect an aerial product at least a thousand times more bulky than the solid litharge employed.’ ‘This experiment,’ it is added, ‘appears to me to be one of the most interesting that has been made since Stahl:’—and so indeed it was, for it involved the superseding of the Stahlian view of, and way of looking at, the phenomena of chemistry. This experiment, in truth, clearly contained the discovery that when brimstone and phosphorus are changed by combustion into acids, and when a metal is burned to a calx, the change is owing, not to the giving out of a phlogiston by these combustibles respectively, but to their absorption of and chemical combination with large quantities of some ponderable kind of air. But nobody saw its vast importance except the experimentalist himself. So late as 1778, six years after the observation was made known, Macquer had a great load taken off his stomach (to use his own expression in a letter) by finding, after all due ventilation of the matter among his scientific gossips, that phlogiston was far from having any need of going to the wall yet. Be it repeated once more, with deep and affectionate respect, that it is no easy thing to give over a cherished theory: it is almost as difficult as to discover a new one; and it is only the frivolous and changeable inventor of new-fangled conceits, or the light-hearted minion of every glittering innovator, that refuses to do homage to the loyal spirit of the honest conservative. We remember

with how much tenderness, we had almost said with what a tone of sadness and sense of injury, the late Doctor Hope chid one of the expectant graduates of the College at Edinburgh, on the occasion of the public defence of their medical theses in 1839, for entertaining the undemonstrable Ammonium-view of the constitution of the ammoniacal salts. The venerable professor retained his well-grounded fidelity to good old Ammonia, saying that he had 'hoped it should at least last all his days.'

Lavoisier knew the worth, and anticipated the future value, of his young and yet immature idea; and that was enough. Dumas has called the particular attention of chemists to the fact, accordingly, that although it was in 1772 that his hero began the interchange of preliminary shots, it was not till 1783, eleven years later and in the course of his forty-first year, that he fairly gave battle to phlogiston. Till that period, says the historian, Lavoisier seemed to have retreated from his position, in the opinion of the superficial. But it was only because he had not yet collected and organized a strong enough array of facts for the defence of his proposals. In truth, after having been eleven years engaged in the working out of his theory, Lavoisier was in the glorious minority of one, in so far as the chemists were concerned: he had only one disciple, and that one was his friend Laplace, the astronomer. It was not till 1787, when the reformer was forty-four years of age and a veteran in science, that Fourcroy began to teach both the phlogiston hypothesis and the oxygen theory in his public lectures, and to draw a comparison between them to the advantage of the latter. Berthollet joined the new cause the same year. Guyton Morveau, Monge, and gradually all the world, including Great Britain, followed their leaders at last. Then, after everybody was converted to the new views, and after the academicians had aided our discoverer in the construction of a nomenclature fitted for the expression and illustration of the new chemistry, it began to be everywhere discussed and applauded as the doctrine of the French chemists forsooth! 'This new blow was very painful to him,' writes his admirable vindicator:—'That theory,' he cried, 'is not, as I hear it called, is not the theory of the French chemists, it is mine own; it is a possession which I claim at the hands of my contemporaries and posterity.' Much was also said, of course, about those things which he owed to Priestley, Cavendish, Scheele. He owed them much; yet he owed them only facts, and facts distorted by the false medium through which their discoverers saw them,

but facts which never conducted them to any such theory, facts which easily fell into order under his theory, and facts that he discovered for the most part almost as soon as themselves. He owed them not a ray of thought: he owed them obstruction. Nor were good-natured and impartial critics slow to remind a generous cosmopolitan public that Jean Rey, (and who knows whom besides?) had previously found that metals were heavier after than before combustion or calcination and did then contain air; but they reminded neither the world nor themselves that the invaluable discovery remained as barren as ice, until the radiance of Lavoisier's searching spirit made it flow over the plain, bringing all manner of fruits out of the willing earth, and going down to bear rich fleets upon its bosom.

It were impossible, within our limits, to trace the succession of particulars in the progress of Lavoisier's career: suffice it that it was arduous, singlehanded, and victorious in his own lifetime. The crowning moment was perhaps the following discovery:—Oxygen had been discovered by Priestley and by himself; he had also ascertained that it is the oxygen of the atmospheric air that becomes fixed (or absorbed and combined with) when brimstone is burnt or a metal calcined; so that the calx of quicksilver was known to contain at least mercury and oxygen, whatsoever else it might contain. He therefore took a known weight of mercurial rust, and drove the oxygen out of it by heat (for simple heating decomposes that oxide); but did so in such an apparatus as enabled him to catch and retain that oxygen, as well as to preserve the liberated quicksilver also. He next recalcined this same mercury, by means of the same oxygen as had just been expelled from the original calx employed; and he thereby obtained the same weight of the calx of mercury as had been introduced into the apparatus at the beginning of the experiment. This was an express illustration of the fact that the red rust of quicksilver is a compound of nothing ponderable but mercury and oxygen, instead of quicksilver being (as had been so long and loyally believed) a compound of its own calx with the positively light phlogiston. When it was made out that the sum of the weights of the mercury and the oxygen, obtainable by heat from any known weight of mercurial calx, is exactly equal to that weight, the experimental demonstration was complete.

The substance of the Lavoisierian chemistry may be briefly summed up in a few paragraphs, but that without being careful to assign each particular to its author, seeing the central facts and the great vivifying truth

of the whole system were Lavoisier's own unmistakable handiwork.

§ 1. Water is not the element of all things, not the first of material forms, not the beginning of creation. It is not even the best or highest in rank, as Pindar expresses it, of four or any other number of elements. It is not an element at all: it is the resulting unity of two elements in combination, hydrogen and oxygen. It is the rust or calx of hydrogen, as iron-rust is the calx of iron, as the oxide of mercury is the calx of quicksilver: it is the oxide of the gaseous metal hydrogen. It is curious to take notice of the changing fortunes of this sweet blood of nature in the history of chemistry. First the matrix of the whole universe, then only one of four elements, though the chief of the quaternion, more latterly looked upon as at least an altogether peculiar and calx-producing principle, and at last discovered to be itself nothing but a liquid product of combustion, one oxyde among many, the mere ashes of so much burnt hydrogen, a common compound of two out of a large number of elements. Yet this composition of water was a critical discovery in its day: for some years the whole science revolved around it; and it is still the typical illustration of the chemistry of analysis and synthesis. James Watt of the Steam-engine, though not otherwise known in chemistry, was the first to form the conception that water is composed of hydrogen and oxygen, or rather of phlogisticated and dephlogisticated airs (the same things as objects certainly, but somewhat different in and for the mind); and Cavendish, a truly great discoverer of facts in this science, was the first to make the proposition good by unassailable experiments: but this all-important discovery was surely mystified, in the thoughts of both these inventors, by their mistaken adhesion to phlogiston; so that it was the light of Lavoisier's system after all, that gave its significance to that capital fact. Lavoisier did make the discovery for himself, it seems; and certainly he would have made it first, but for the anticipation of Watt and Cavendish: yet the grand distinction of the French lawgiver is the circumstance that he was bringing about a reformation, developing a vast system, and exemplifying a new method of inquiry, while our countrymen were the conservative seekers of only particular facts. Such appears to be a righteous judgment regarding the several claims of these three investigators in this matter. Since they represent Scotland, England and France respectively, it is but natural that a good deal should have been written with some acerbity on all the sides of the

question. Lord Brougham, Arago, Dumas, have all broken their lances in trying to settle the rival claims, to say nothing of the kindly effort of one of the relatives of Watt. It is not long, indeed, since a deceased critic of our own mingled in the controversy, investigating and adjudicating on its merits, with the skill of an advocate and the love of a friend, if not with all the impersonality of a judge. The question has likewise been handled more recently, and that with much knowledge and rare acumen, in the *Life* of their name-sire sent forth by the Cavendish Society. On the whole, however, while feeling that all such questions of priority are but poor things, we stand by the opinion already pronounced without misgiving, but also without much concern, for Lavoisier can spare deductions from his estate of fame, which would impair the heritage of either Cavendish or Watt.

As for the air of the atmosphere, the new chemistry found it to be no more an elemental principle of nature than the water of the ocean, but just a mechanical mixture, for the most part, of some 20 parts of oxygen, and 80 parts of nitrogen or ozote, kept habitually moist by a varying ratio of watery vapour, whether visible or invisible. It also contains some 4 parts in 1000 of carbonic acid gas, to say nothing of those traces of ammonia, carburetted hydrogen (and what not?) more lately discovered in its all-embracing substance. To the earlier Lavoisierian, then, the atmosphere comprised the three gases, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and the hardest of solid bodies, namely, carbon or the diamond,—the four organogens or main products of the decomposition of organized creatures, plants and animals.

On the other hand, the earth, the third of the old elemental quartad, is the resultant of the combinations and mixtures and juxtapositions of some seventeen metals (still to speak from the point of view of chemistry before the discoveries of Humphrey Davy, the great consummator of the movement of Lavoisier), of six non-metallic bodies or combustibles (three known, namely, carbon, sulphur, phosphorus; and three inferred to exist, namely, the muriatic, fluoric and boracic radicals, as they were called), of five earths, of two alkalis, and of the three atmospheric gases. But oxygen was the most important of all these provisional elements or undecomposed bodies. It converted the three known combustibles into acids, it was supposed to have converted the three unknown combustible radicals into the corresponding known acids; it converted the metals into bases or so many sorts of earth or alkali, and it was supposed to be the cal-

cifying principle of the regular earths and alkalis; and, in fine, the compounds of oxygen with other elements, whether known or shrewdly inferred, were perceived to be the most abundant and widely spread of all natural combinations:—so that this whole crisis of quick development may well be called the epoch of oxygen and the balance. It was the pneumatic chemistry that prepared the way for it, it was the balance that ushered it on the scene, and oxygen is its great result. The discovery of oxygen rendered the balance both applicable and necessary, the use of the balance put oxygen in its place within the system of nature and of science, and they can never be put asunder in the memory of the chemist. A glass-covered balance, turning on an edge of adamant, with the antique symbol of the mercurial calx in one scale and the modern representative of mercury + oxygen in the other, is that *Libra* of the historical *Zodiac* into which the sun of Chemistry rose, as soon as the star of Lavoisier was fairly in the ascendant.

§ 2. There is no such creature as phlogiston or the matter of fire. When a body, compound or elementary, is burned, it does not give out imaginary levitative phlogiston: it takes in real gravitative oxygen. Yet Lavoisier, in laying the matter of fire (with its positive levity) to rest for ever, could not escape from its buried power over him. Black had discovered the fact of latent heat, and explained his conception of the phenomenon with the help of the hypothesis of caloric or the matter of heat, a substance, not monstrosously endowed with lightness indeed, but possessed of no weight whatever, the very ghost of poor phlogiston! Lavoisier adopted this caloric. When phosphorus burned in vital air with a flame nearly as dazzling as the sun, he knew that it entered with rapidity into chemical union with the oxygen, and he attributed the heat of the flame to the extrication of the imponderable matter of heat or caloric from the phosphorus and especially from the oxygen, to say nothing of the light of the flame in the present connexion. In short, the Empedoclean matter of fire, or rather the Stahlian phlogiston, supposed to have less than no weight, was just broken up into caloric, the matter of heat, and an analogous matter of light, both supposed to be absolutely imponderable projectiles, of a truly material nature, and capable of fixation by certain of the ponderable forms of matter. Founding on a mischievous and purely geometrical abstraction, to the effect that extension is the only essential property of matter, Black and Lavoisier admitted into

their system the notion of a kind of matter, capable of entering into chemical combination with the indubitable kinds of matter, and yet, not only without visibility or palpability or separability, but absolutely without weight, without the tendency to gravitate towards the central body of the earth, without the power to help the rest of the world to draw towards and move round the sun, in a word, without one of the actual common properties of all the known forms of matter, let the mediæval scholastic or the modern geometer call it an essential property or not! Posterity will assuredly regard this as one of the half-truths or metaphysical mystifications at the core of the Lavoisierian chemistry, as it is well known to be by many now-a-days, notwithstanding that our text-books in this highly positive science are still too full of matters of heat, of light, of electricity, of galvanism, of magnetism, and even of unheard-of odyles or ogres, which the genius of Fact might have been expected to have driven beyond the confines of Science for ever, after the discovery of oxygen and the use of the balance.

§ 3. Oxygen was not only the great agent of combustions (by the extrication of its caloric on its energetic union with the ponderable combustibles), but it was also the principal party to a multitude of more peaceable operations. The respiration of animals, the process of vegetation, and many less important natural phenomena, were all found to depend on this constituent of the atmosphere. It was perceived to be incidental to the growth of organic beings, to their sustenance, and to their decay. What was true then is true still:—oxygen is the mainspring of a vast proportion of all those movements that are constantly going on under the figured face and visible indications of the terrestrial horizon. It is both the builder and the destroyer of the ever-shifting scene around us; at once the finger and the tooth of time.

§ 4. The conception of chemical union received a great, though by no means a full, accession of clearness from the Lavoisierian movement. The word *Affinity*, standing for the force in virtue of which the chemical combination of two or more bodies takes place, was first used by Barchusen and first defined by Boerhaave. The very word, however, shows that even the latter was under the obsolete notion that it is bodies standing in affinity with one another, that is to say, bodies resembling each other, that are the most prone to enter into mutual union. Mercury was fancied to amalgamate so easily with certain of the metals because it is

of a like nature with them. In the new chemistry, however, the strongest and most prevalent compounds were those consisting of the most dissimilar ingredients, for example, those of oxygen and the metal. The term *Afinity*, therefore, began at once to be equivalent with *Chemical Attraction*, which also began to be understood as a force acting among the invisible particles of matter, just as gravitation exerts itself among the visible masses of creation:—a thing, the latter, which Newton had seen and said long before the dawn of this, the chemistry of fact. But the Lavoisierians, especially Fourcroy and all who have come after him, went further in this direction than they were (or are yet) warranted by the facts of the science. They inferred, and even explicitly stated, that chemical attraction or particular affinity displays itself only between the particles of different kinds of matter, for instance, between hydrogen and oxygen, but by no means between one particle and another of hydrogen or of oxygen. They defined chemical affinity, indeed, as nothing else than the attraction of cohesion mutually exerted between differing kinds of matter. The particles of a piece of brimstone hold together, in the piece, by the force of the attraction of cohesion, as it is named; and the holding together of mercury and oxygen, in the mercurial calx, was attributed to the same force acting between the two differing kinds of element, namely, quicksilver and oxygen. Without entering on the discussion of this vital point, we venture to foretell that this will ere long be considered as another error in the very heart of the Lavoisierian chemistry; and it is an error which the Daltonian movement has not yet done away with.

§ 5. The Lavoisierian definition of the elemental nature was perfect. It was the first clear conception ever attained to and uttered on the subject. This great lawgiver of Chemistry become Positive, an apt scholar in scientific scepticism and the admirer of Condillac, defined a chemical element to be nothing more (and nothing less) than a material substance not yet analyzable, not yet broken up into simpler forms; in short, a body not yet decomposed but not therefore indecomponible, to be called simple for the time being but not necessarily always to remain in the list of elements, elementary not in an absolute but only in a logical and provisional sense of the term. The metals, the earths, the alkalis, the combustibles, the three gaseous organogens, were therefore all registered as elements for the meantime. Davy decomposed the alkalis and earths, proving them to be the oxydes of so many

new and unheard-of metals. The same chemist, certainly the noblest of the disciples and workmen of Lavoisier, found out the true nature of chlorine, and thereby deprived oxygen of the right to its name; for oxygen had been prematurely chronicled as the acid-gendering element, but chlorine was now discovered to be at once a simple body and an engenderer of acids just as truly as oxygen. Iodine, selenium, silicon, titanium, rhodium and many other substances, equally elementary with oxygen and the old metals, have followed in their turns, and there are now no fewer than some sixty Lavoisierian elements, while there may well be a hundred of them before the century is out. There is no probable limit, in truth, to the number of this species of elementary principle. If the chemist could but dig deeper into the surface of the world he inhabits, or could be licensed to carry his quarrying gear to the moon, or could even lay hold of the smallest of the Junonian asteroids, to say nothing that might be construed into impertinence concerning the diggings of either Jupiter or Venus, what a pile of such simple bodies he might build up! It should never be forgotten that he has hitherto done nothing but scratch the outside of this old Hertha, and that only to the depth of the thickness of this paper-leaf in comparison with a sphere of two feet in diameter. Yes, he has merely raked a little among the outermost ashes of this great globe itself, the hearth of the family of man, and his own body will soon be ashes among ashes, earth in earth, when the spirit that was in him, returned to God who gave it, may well smile at the remembrance of yon dim spot which men call Earth, and at the century of elements he had gathered from all its little heights and hollows. In fact and in brief, then, there may be six hundred of such elements as ours just as well as sixty; and almost every year is actually adding a new one to the catalogue. In the meantime, it is to be understood that, from not one of these present sixty, can the hottest furnace seven times heated, the coldest freezing mixture, the strongest and steadiest galvanic pile, the most thunderous of electric batteries, or the most pungent reagent, were it even fluorine or potassium at a white heat, extract anything but itself:—gold yields gold, iron yields iron, hydrogen yields hydrogen, only gold and iron and hydrogen, to all the solicitations of the fiercest analytics yet known. 'We stand before the guarded door of nature: the strong bolts will not move: everything fails us, everything!'

Yet it is hard to think that all those sixty creatures are truly simple or elementary.

The instinct of humanity revolts against believing that the Maker has departed from his wonted simplicity of procedure in this one part of creation, and flung such a number of unchangeable elements from his immediate hand. Many thoughtful and ingenious men, indeed, have frankly supposed that it were more like the nature of the Deity, as shewn by his interpreted works, to pour forth the unreckonable variety of things from the bosom of one or two principles. Thales and the Greek physicists, Ghebiri and the polypharmacists, Roger Bacon and the alchemists, Stahl and the phlogistians, Lavoisier himself, Humphry Davy, Prout, even Berzelius himself, that man of multitude, have all given more or less explicit expression to this native yearning of the thoughts of the heart of man towards simplicity, that is to say, towards some unity or other underlying the multiplicity of appearances, in this subterranean domain of nature. Man does not love multiplicity; he admires it; but it is unity that he loves, for it moves his imagination while it touches his heart, not only making the whole world kin, but also lessening the distance between that world and God. The next great question in chemistry then, say rather, the perpetual and the greatest question in the science, is precisely this;—What is the interior nature of those elements? From the Lavoisierian point of view, in plain earnest, that is the one question of the age. The science bids us ask, and perhaps nature is ready to answer it: but what shall be done, since no known analytical power can move one of those steadfast natures from its propriety? Let synthesis be tried, if analysis has failed: synthesis has never been tried. Be it observed, too, that it is in the highest degree probable that all the sixty present elements are equidistant from simplicity: they are all equally compound (and equally simple, for that matter), if there be any truth in the unanimous testimony of chemical analogy. Their case is exactly like that of potassa, soda, lime, baryta, strontia, and their congeners, before the discovery of potassium; that is to say, potassa once discovered to be a metallic calx or oxyde, all the rest were clearly metallic oxydes too, as experiment was not long of shewing. In the same way, if the secret of one of those silent and tantalizing elements be discovered, the secret of them all is out.*

* For more particular insight into the first epoch of positive chemistry, the reader is referred backwards to an article on Davy in the third Number of this Review, and forwards to an intended criticism of the Daltonian movement: But the perusal of Lavoisier's *Traité Élémentaire* will do more for him

Comte's generalization of the particulars known regarding the growth of man's idea of nature has already been referred to, and it cannot but be interesting to notice the expression of his law in the history of the theory of fire, that impressive phenomenon which continued to be the central point of chemistry until the later Lavoisierians at length put it in its proper and subordinate place. Common combustion, as brought about by energetic oxidation, will always be an important object of study; but, now that other gases are known to support combustion, now that a pair of solid bodies are easily made to extricate heat and light without the presence of any kind of atmosphere, and now that fire is understood to consist in the production of heat and light by or during any chemical action that is intense enough, the venerable process falls to be considered as an accident and not an essence. In one word, the Lavoisierian theory of fire, thus widened by the discoveries that have flowed from it, and stripped of the adhesion of caloric, is an illustration of the third epoch of human thought upon the subject, according to the classification of the French positivist:—it is the plain, unsophisticated, positive statement of the facts of the case, as these present themselves to the senses and the judgment according to sense of the true chemist. The second, the metaphysicizing or fictitious stage of the theory of fire is represented by caloric, still more curiously by phlogiston, and also by the ancient element and empyrean:—abstractions of the mind transformed into things, forbidden creatures, veritable ghosts. And as for the earliest, the religious or superstitious time of knowledge or thought concerning this fiery manifestation of the powers of nature, not only is the mythological story, how Prometheus snatched the element down from a region all on fire* beyond the atmosphere and its thousand stars, an indication of the idolatrous feeling flung around a natural wonder, but the salamander or fire-spirit of the Rosicrucian mystics was a supernatural creation of the theosophic sort, almost belonging to post-mediæval Europe. Fire for the altar, strange fire, fire from heaven, and burnt-offerings are the common elements of all the antique worship of the world. Fire has also yielded some of the strongest of the imagery of the sacred books of Christianity. In the end the earth is to be burnt up, the very elements are to melt with fervent heat, the heavens

than any later dissertation, especially if followed by the study of Berthollet's *Statique Chimique*.

* The word Empyrean means nothing else, of course, than the Place on Fire.

are to pass away like a scroll in the flames; while the horrible nature of sin is set forth by that place where the fire is not quenched: and surely the image of everburning, yet unwasting fire is a symbol more easily turned into ridicule by the frivolous understanding than exhausted by the serious imagination.*

But the true deification of Fire was that of Zoroaster and the Guebres, those worshippers of the Sun. To them the thing was Divine, the peculiar Shekinah of Jehovah, or the supreme manifestation of God among men upon the earth. The less refining multitude did assuredly, by the million and during long ages of time, look upon the sun as very god of very god; on the moon and stars as his heavenly host; and on the leven-brand, the unrestrainable fire, the culinary hearth, and the household lamp as his flaming ministers. It is difficult now-a-days to realize this devotion—in the presence of a chemical product, a combination of caloric and light, a double vibration, a pair of imponderables, or even a couple of dynamides! The fact is that Christendom has at last got into the extreme opposite point of view to all this worship of nature, and the Beautiful one has been degraded into a drudge, 'none so poor to do her reverence.' The Briton of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries actually conceives of the world as an amazingly complicated, yet exquisitely simple piece of mechanism, put together very much as a watch is made by a watchmaker, and left to go according to law, the great Creator withdrawn to some central heaven, thence beholding all its evolutions, and ready to interfere whenever the gracious purposes of his will require a present Deity. Zoroaster, on the other hand, saw nothing but god and only god in nature; he felt as though God shone upon his eye, almost without a veil, in Fire; and he bowed his head in adoration: while his people, as usual, soon confounded the idol with the divinity, the sign with the idea, and became idolaters.

What a thing Fire must have been to the primitive man the first time it flashed upon him! Say that he kept watch over his people; that at the chilliest hour of the night, just before sunrise, he noticed how a dry stick grew warm when rubbed against his club; that he rubbed them again, more stoutly still, and it became hot: at it again, with the wonder of a child and the strength of twenty men, he flung it down for it scorched his hand; yet he could not choose

but try again, and it smoked; again and again, quicker and quicker, longer and longer, he pursued the wild experiment until it burst into flame, and the sun arose in the east:—What were the fire upon the brand but the spirit of the blessed sun, come down to dwell with him and his? It is surely not impossible to feel how, in the absence of science, with the presence of only an incalculably small amount of experience, in an intellect far more observative than analytical and a young soul capable of little more than wonder and love, the worship of the Sun and Fire might arise: and, once risen on a national and continental heart, it could never set until the fulness of a better time were come. Nor is Christianity herself the reconciling genius of the world, ashamed to draw upon the memory of that old faith; for she lifts up her Prince of Peace to the homage of the nations under the image of the Zoroastrian god:—

THE SUN OF RIGHTEOUSNESS WITH HEALING
IN HIS BEAMS.

-
- ART. III.—1. *Storia Civile della Toscana dal 1737 al 1848.* Di ANTONIO ZOBBI. Tomi 1-3. Svo. Firenze, 1850, 1851.
2. *Gli Ultimi Rivolgimenti Italiani: Memorie Storiche.* Di F. A. GUALTERIO. Vols. 1-5. Firenze, 1852.
3. *Lo Stato Romano dall'anno 1815 al 1850.* Per LUIGI CARLO FARINI. Volume Terzo. Firenze, 1851.
4. *Florentine History from the earliest Authentic Records to the Accession of Ferdinand the Third, Grand Duke of Tuscany.* By HENRY EDWARD NAPIER, Captain R.N. In 6 vols. London, 1847.
5. *Italy in the Nineteenth Century.* By JAMES WHITESIDE, Q.C., M.P. Fifth Edition, 3 vols. London, 1852.
6. *Memoirs of Scipio di Ricci, late Bishop of Pistoia and Prato, Reformer of Catholicism in Tuscany.* Edited from the Original of M. D. PALTER, by THOMAS ROSCOE. 2 vols. London.
7. *Casa Guidi Windows.* A Poem. By ELIZABETH BARRETT BROWNING. London, 1851.
8. *Religious Liberty in Tuscany in 1851.* London.
9. *Apologia della Vita Politica di F. D. Guerrazzi, Scritta da lui medesimo.* Un volume in Svo. Firenze, 1851.
10. *First Annual Report of the Society of the Friends of Italy.* London, 1852.

* To say nothing of Dante and Milton at all in this connexion, if the reader would see how this symbol pierces and informs a Christian poet, let him read the Devil's Dream of Thomas Aird.

OUTSIDE the San Gallo gate of Florence stands the triumphal arch raised to commemorate the entrance of Francis III., Duke of Lorraine, and of Maria Theresa of Austria, on the evening of the 19th January 1738, into the capital of their new dominions. That arch—a heavy imitation of the arch of Constantine, by an architect of Lorraine—stands as a great landmark in the history of the Tuscan Dukedom. The very sculptures that deform it speak of a new dynasty in old Etruria—the double-headed eagle grasps in its claws both the sceptre and the sword. Giovanni Gastone, the last of the Medici, had been borne to his tomb in San Lorenzo, to that magnificent chapel, the burial-place of his family, where the marvellous figures of Michael Angelo—"the ghosts" of Julian and of Duke Lorenzo—"are sitting on their sepulchres." Decrepit and diseased, the worn out profligate had sunk childless to the grave, and the fairest region of Italy was freed from a race that for three centuries had been "its glory and its shame."

We do not care to dwell on that dark record which constitutes the history of the later Medici, and we have no time to describe Tuscany as it was in the days of that old priest-ridden Cosmo III., whom Addison describes so spicily in his "Travels." We wish rather to speak of Tuscany in later days, and whether fortunately or unfortunately, we have "no end of books" on such a subject. We have given a sample above, and we think it peculiarly *apropos* that a history like Zobi's, so elaborate, and so thoroughly liberal, should be just now in course of publication. Captain Napier's six heavy Dutch-looking little volumes had by no means exhausted the more valuable materials of "Florentine History," and on the reign of Leopold I. they were peculiarly defective. And we thank Signor Zobi especially for his ample treatment of the great ecclesiastical questions which excited Tuscany seventy years ago, and are now in some degree exciting it again; and for these chapters on the clergy that read like a tale of the Decameron, even in the pages of a sober historian. Mr. Whiteside's book has at least received the stamp of public approval, as it has reached a fifth edition. Few of our modern writers on Italy have produced a work so readable; and this makes amends for a variety of smaller matters which we are not at all disposed to carp at. We have had occasion to admire at times the happy art with which an intelligent tourist whose "stay is limited," contrives to work up the loose materials of a few street pamphlets, through which he has

spelled his way by aid of dictionary, into a handsome volume, of which, the chances are, the information so liberally communicated by couriers and waiters, and *commissionaires*, aided by the unfailing "Murray," forms the staple. Mr. Whiteside, who very properly does just as he likes in these matters, has evidently picked up some of his details from such "distinguished" and "standard" authorities, and we do not know any one who has made better use of the litter of street pamphlets. A tract of Massimo d'Azeglio, well meriting a place—a history of St. Philomena, by some abbate of marvellous credulity, or of strong faith in the credulity of his readers—and, above all, "The True Story of Beatrice Cenci," condensed from a little nameless volume about as authentic as the "History of the Seven Champions of Christendom," as we strongly suspect Mr. Whiteside knew right well—besides law and literature, manners and morals, and the want of both as a variety. Such a book is just what a traveller needs, neither too heavy nor too trivial or sufficiently comprehensive—

"Quidquid agunt homines nostra farrago libelli."

Signor Farini's third volume, though perhaps less interesting on the whole than the two which preceded, indicates, we think, decided progress in the art of writing history, and in truth the loose slippery second-rate newspaper style of his earlier volumes afforded considerable room for improvement. It is already known to all who take an interest in Italian matters by the translation of Mr. Gladstone—a book much better than the original. It is to be regretted that that accomplished translator did not choose instead the far more profound and interesting volumes of the Marquis Gualterio of Orvieto, unquestionably the finest work that has yet appeared on the history of Italy since 1815. It must be admitted that the task of translating would have been considerable, as the five volumes already published bring down the history only to 1847; and at this rate, ere the work be completed, there may very possibly be another revolution, and materials in abundance for a few additional volumes as a sequel. Still, were the documents that are appended simply passed over, the mere text of Gualterio would give a far more perfect idea of the great Italian parties to an English reader than any other work we could name: and we do not yet despair of seeing some attempt made to "do" it into our vernacular. Meantime, in addition to sober prose, we

have a distillation of Italian politics in poetry, under the attractive though somewhat enigmatical name of "Casa Guidi Windows." We have no time to criticise at length a poem so vigorous and so beautiful, and calculated to take so high a place for its own merits, apart from the interest of Italian politics. It is, in short, the poetical apotheosis of Young Italy; and yet that young gentleman is pretty soundly lectured before his canonization. Our object is more sober, and less ambitious: and leaving Mrs. Browning to watch the Arno as it shoots "right through the heart of Florence," we would occupy ourselves in tracing the political history and prospects of Tuscany, as suggested in these and sundry other works, "too tedious to mention." They are of special present interest, seeing that all Tuscany has been excited of late by sundry attempts to abolish her boasted legislation, and especially the laws of the first Leopold.

We shall endeavour to convey an idea, in as few words as possible, of the great outlines of that policy which raised Tuscany to so high a place among civilized nations, and of those laws which for more than a century have been vitally connected with the social and political wellbeing of her people. The Regency that governed Tuscany in the absence of Francis II.* made no progress for years towards the removal of the glaring abuses of the Medicean legislation: even Richcourt and Rucellai feared to provoke too hastily the jealousy of the Court of Rome by any measure that might be construed into resistance of Papal authority, and hence their policy was rather that of defence than that of aggression. The history of the Regency may be summed up in a few words:—a long struggle with the Church, with clamorous monks and refractory bishops, the Franzonis of their day, aided and abetted by the Papal Court in their opposition to the very appearance of reform; another co-ordinate struggle with feudal nobles in the Apennines, surrounded with their *bravi* and banditti, such as are painted in Manzoni's romance; an ineffectual attempt on the Maremme; a few useful laws, and a step in advance towards the principle of Free Trade, but little real improvement on the condition of the country. The priests were still in the ascendant; the Jesuits were the tutors and schoolmasters in the land of Macchiavel and Galileo; the two universities, Pisa and Siena, languished under a rule that would have made the very sun stand still in obedience to the Canon

law; learning had decayed—even painting and sculpture had degenerated; the Della Cruscan Academy alone flourished in all the insupportable pedantry of "word-catchers that lived on syllables."

And such was the state of matters in 1765, when PETER LEOPOLD, the younger son of Francis I. and of Maria Theresa, ascended the Grand-Ducal throne at the early age of eighteen. The rival claims of Austria and Spain had been adjusted by the marriage of the young prince with the Infanta Maria Louisa, and Tuscany assumed again the position of an independent kingdom. The State was too small to be a gainer by taking any decided part in European contests, and Leopold's first aim was to establish *its strict neutrality*; and this point being so far secured by his relations with Spain and Austria, his efforts were directed, during the twenty-five years of his reign, to the internal improvement of his dominions, so as to make of Tuscany *a model kingdom*. His first great measure indicated the whole course of his future legislation: a year after his accession the harvest having failed, and a famine threatening the land, Leopold at once freed grain, native and foreign, from all commercial restrictions, and inaugurated that principle of Free Trade which he afterwards made the law of the State. Gian Gastone was still wearing out his days in Florence when Sallust Anthony Bandini, a priest of Siena, presented to the ministers of the Grand-Duke his project of Free Trade in Corn as the great remedy for the miserable condition of the Sanese Maremme. The Cobden of those days was considered as either knave or fool—the ministers did not know exactly which—but at all events they could see no earthly connexion between commercial freedom and the draining of the Tuscan marshes. But the Sanese archdeacon was persevering as an Anti-Corn-Law-Leaguer, and not only wrote his "Economic Discourse," but supported by Pompeo Neri, the ablest Tuscan jurist of his day, he obtained a trial of his principles from Francis II.; and when the first expositor of those days was no longer living to plead them with his "unadorned eloquence," they were established as a fundamental law of Tuscany, and with such results as to silence all unprejudiced opponents. It was the industry of a free people that tamed the Alps of Switzerland, and reclaimed from the ocean the lands of Holland: the Huguenots of France would have settled in the Maremme after the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, had not the weak and illiberal Cosmo III. prevented them, and driven

* Francis III., Duke of Lorraine, is known as Francis II. of Tuscany, and Francis I. of Austria.

them elsewhere with their arts and their industry; and Bandini rightly judged, though he dared not speak it plainly to a Medici, that it was not simply from natural causes, but from the effects of long misgovernment, that those wide tracts of country that had contained a large part of the population of old Etruria were now reduced to pestilential marshes. The colonists of Lorraine died in those fatal swamps; of the thousand who had been introduced in the time of the Regency, only thirty-five remained when Leopold began his work of amelioration, and the depopulated region had become still more dreary by being made a place of exile for political offenders. Between death and the Maremma there was but little to choose, and it required all the German perseverance of Leopold to carry on the work of reclaiming; but his new system of leasing the waste lands, and his liberal expenditure of means, produced a marvellous change, though his task was left unfinished; and it was reserved for the second Leopold to acquire still greater glory, according to Giusti's Satire, by draining "the pockets and the marshes" of Tuscany.

To note all the Leopoldine reforms would be to write the history of five and twenty years, during which one measure followed another with a rapidity almost unparalleled in the history of modern legislation. The commerce of Tuscany revived; Leghorn especially made marvellous progress; and if the new policy was injurious to the craft of a few grasping monopolists, it tended to promote "the greatest good of the greatest number." The pernicious system of farming the revenues was abolished; ecclesiastical property (and even the Grand-Ducal patrimony) was subjected to taxation, and the revenue increased; the whole system of finance was revised; the national debt was in great part paid off; a municipal system was established; the old Medicean Consulta abolished; leases, entails, intramural interments were disposed of in succession; and, in fine, in November 1786 was published that Criminal Code which has obtained an European celebrity. The old instruments of torture, the memorials of a bygone legislation, were burned in front of the Bargello. We have neither time nor taste for examining the merits or defects of the Leopoldine Code, as it has been since both tampered with and perverted. It had nothing corresponding to our English Habeas Corpus or Trial by Jury—its moral estimate of crime was in many points defective, and mild to a fault—the entire abolition of capital punishment was a measure

more than questionable; and Leopold himself, and afterwards his son, re-established the penalty of death, though not with any very just appreciation of the great law which should guide the legislator in a subject so momentous; but we are ready fully to accord with Forti and Galleatti, that it is "the most generous code that ever issued from the Cabinet of an absolute prince."

But it is more to our purpose to glance at those ecclesiastical reforms which Leopold, directed chiefly by the Senator Rucellai and the Bishop of Pistoia, carried out so boldly in opposition to the Papal Court. Mr. Whiteside has suggested the propriety of republishing the life of Scipio de Ricci for the benefit of Italy—a measure the expediency of which may be fairly questioned. The value of that remarkable book—remarkable when it was first published—lies very much in the documents which are appended, and the revelations they make of all that was polluting in the conventual life of Pistoia and Prato. It would be like opening to the public the closed chambers of the Museo Borbonico, for the sake of a lecture on moral depravity. And that life itself is one of the clearest proofs that an attempt at reforming Roman Catholicism has but slender chance of success, and that another standard must be lifted up in Italy than the yellow flag of the keys and mitre. The Pope who condemned the Synod of Pistoia was Pius VI.—"that honest Braschi who drained the pontine marshes"—and to come to later times, the few years of the Pontificate of Pius IX. might dissipate for ever the idea that Romish infallibility can deny itself and change; so that even Gioberti himself has entirely given up, in his "rinnovamento civile," his first and favourite theory of Italian regeneration by means of a reforming Papacy. There is one stanza in the "Cassa Guidi Windows," (the twenty-sixth,) which contains more good sense, besides good poetry *gratis*, on the subject of reforming Pontiffs, than some volumes written of late, *ex professo*, on that debated question; and as long as a Pope "must hold by Popes," and "by Councils from Nicea up," or rather down, "to Trent"—as long as he must "resent each man's particular conscience," and sit "attesting with his pastoral ring and staff,"

"To such a picture of our Lady, hit
Off well by artist angels, though not half
As fair as Giotto would have painted it,"

and as long as he must do a thousand things besides, according to the Canons, we do

not expect that either Pius IX. or any future Pius, Gregory or Benedict, will ever sit in the chair of Hildebrand, "with Andrea Doria's forehead." But this by the way. The life of Scipio de Ricci, very creditably expurgated, is now before the English public, and had the editor condensed it into a single volume, the book would have lost nothing of its value. Besides, in these days of Athenian thirst for novelty, Mr. Roscoe ought to have avoided the appearance of foisting his two octavos on the public as the translation of something new, in fact, "of one of the most popular works of the day." *Davvero!* We were impressed with the conviction that De Rotter's "*Vie de Scipion de Ricci*" had been published in Brussels in 1825, and we remember glancing over the misty volumes with that title, which bore all the appearance of having been thumbed for a quarter of a century. That old book of De Rotter is on the whole a dull and tedious narrative, and all that it contains of value to a modern reader has long since been better told elsewhere. Especially Zobi's chapters on ecclesiastical matters are worth half a dozen volumes like De Rotter's.

Yet Scipio de Ricci merited a biography of some kind. He was a Jansenist, devout and pure in morals as Arnauld or Pascal, though far beneath the intellectual measure of the great Portroyalists; to him more than to any other, Leopold was indebted for those ecclesiastical principles which he wrought into the laws of Tuscany. We enter on this subject more at length, because Leopold II. is now undoing the work of his wiser ancestor, and because Piedmont is fighting the same battle at the present day that was fought in Tuscany in the eighteenth century.

At the period when the Medicean dynasty became extinct, (A.D. 1737,) Tuscany with a population of 890,608, had no less than 27,108 ecclesiastics, (Zobi, vol. i. p. 323,) and fully one-third of the whole country was the property of the Church. The land was of course a little monkish Paradise, just like Palermo, as Lord Shrewsbury pictured it forth the other day to the Milesian imagination of Father Fogarty. Popish ideas, however, differ on these points, and it was discovered that the monastic interpretation of certain commandments of the Decalogue was—to say the least—peculiar. Rome threw the shield of her protection over "the holy order of St. Dominick," and the offending names of Prato and Pistoia, whose almost inconceivable immorality had been brought to light by Ricci; but notwithstanding the intrigues of the Holy See,

the obnoxious convents were suppressed, and stringent laws were enacted, regulating the mode of admission in future into the monastic orders, and determining the age at which the habit or the veil could be assumed, with other regulations as to dowry, tending to dry up the resources of the recluses. The Mortmain laws of 1751, which the senator Rucellai had introduced during the regency as the first check to an increase of priestly wealth and power, were still further extended in 1769, and in twelve years the number of the friars was reduced to nearly 2000, and the convents had sunk from 321 to 213. Besides, the regular clergy, with all the conventual establishments, were subjected directly to the authority of the bishops—a measure violently resisted by Rome, for the friars are the great Papal militia for the upholding of the Papal rule throughout Catholic Christendom. The bishops again were chosen by the Government, and the Pope was limited to the simple ceremony of confirming the appointment. It was a thoroughly Erastian proceeding of course, but Rome is a great political organization rather than a Church, and claims the right of interfering, by virtue of its spiritual supremacy, in the civil administration of kingdoms professedly independent. When the Roman Catholic clergy made a violent outcry against the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill introduced by Lord John Russell, they were perfectly well aware that in every one of the Catholic kingdoms they had been subjected to laws far more stringent than that mild protest against Papal aggression.

The Papal tribunals claimed the right of publishing bulls, acts, indulgences, and the prohibitory index, without the authority of the Government; and, above all, the bull "*In Cœna Domini*," with all the "improvements" of Ghislieri, was duly read on Holy Thursday, putting forth the supreme authority of the Pope, by right divine, over the princes and subjects of every Catholic State. These claims were met by the royal right of the Exequatur, which prohibited all such publication without the authority of the civil power. It is marvellous with what unity of purpose the Romish Church has continued for centuries to sustain the power she has usurped, and to contend inch by inch for every vestige of her dominion. The Mortmain laws had been established elsewhere, by the Dukes of Savoy—by the Princes of Este in Modena and Ferrara—by the Republic of Genoa—and, above all, by Venice. Siena, the great Ghibelline city of the Middle Ages, had wisely restricted the acquisition of property by ec-

clesiastics; but Florence, with her Guelphic sympathies, had allowed the religious orders to encroach till they held "in dead hands" one-third of her possessions. But the Exequatur was embodied even in the Florentine statute of 1415, which contained provisions equivalent to the "Provisors" and "Præmunire" of our English statute-book: and in the time of Cosmo I., when the decrees of the Council of Trent were published in Tuscany, they were first authorized by the Grand Duke, and confirmed by the authority of the Florentine Senate.—(*Zobi*, vol. ii. p. 84.)

The readers of St. Priest may remember his singularly graphic description of the visit of the two sons of Maria Theresa—Joseph II. of Austria and Leopold of Tuscany—to the city of the Church, on the death of the old Rezzonico.—(*Fall of the Jesuits*, chap. iii.) There can be little doubt of their influence on the conclave that elected Ganganelli; and, at all events, when the brief was issued that suppressed the Jesuits, (July 21st 1773,) it immediately received the Royal Exequatur in Austria and Tuscany. The Company of Jesus had been introduced into the latter State by Laynez, at the invitation of Eleanor of Toledo, wife of Cosmo I., and had succeeded in establishing their colleges in all the great towns of the Duchy. Lorenzo de Ricci, the general of the Order at the time of the suppression, was himself a Florentine, and a near relative of the reforming Bishop of Pistoia, to whom he bequeathed his silver crucifix: but the rooting out of the formidable society was a part of the plans of Leopold; their colleges were closed and their property confiscated; their "House of Exercises," in the old fortress of San Miniato, was dismantled, and their few books added to the rich collection of the Magliabecchian Library, and after 220 years they were finally driven out of Tuscany. *The brief of Ganganelli is still the law of the State.* The Jesuits as an order have never been able to obtain admission since, though but lately it was attempted to introduce the Ladies of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, the precursors and outriders (we beg pardon of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart for such a phrase) of the Company of Loyola; and till the laws of Peter Leopold are abolished, they can never legally re-establish themselves in the land where they had signalized both their science and their devotion by the imprisonment of Galileo. The Jesuits at first resisted the Grand-Ducal order, and then had recourse to "pious fraud" in seeking to keep up their society under its new symbol of the Sacred Heart, but at last they were obliged to yield, by either secularizing themselves or

going into exile. A few clung to the old walls of their dismantled "Houses," while others acted with the spirit of real patriots, and

"Left their country for their country's good."

This measure was followed by the abolition of the right of sanctuary. Leopold had concluded a Concordat with Pius VI. in 1775, but finding that Rome could turn the most seemingly liberal agreement to her own advantage, he resolved in future "to have nothing to do with Concordats," but to act on his own authority. The sanctuaries were cleared accordingly of the robbers and assassins who had sought the protection of the Church to avoid the penalty of their crimes. The Foro Ecclesiastico, and other privileged courts, were still in existence, but in 1778 the tribunal of the Nunciature was abolished, and then the tribunal of the Holy Office (in 1782.) Even Republican Florence, though adhering to the great Guelphic party, had resisted the interference of the Popes with her internal administration, and it was only in 1560 that for the first time a Papal Nuncio held court within her walls. But the Inquisition—and it is well to recall it in these days of re-action—had a prescriptive right of more than 500 years; for, more than five centuries ago, there were adherents of "the pure gospel" in the fair city. The Paulicians or Paterini had a numerous party, but Dominick of Guzman had just headed an exterminating crusade against the Albigenses on the plains of Languedoc, and the dog with the blazing torch—the chosen and appropriate emblem of St. Dominick—ere long lighted his fires in Italy. Fra Pietro of Verona, better known in the annals of his order as Pietro Martire, roused the Florentines against the unoffending Paulicians, and the result was not so much a civil war as a massacre. In the Via Guicciardini, opposite the Church of Laura Felicità, on the spot where one of these extraordinary battles was fought against the Paterini, stands a column surmounted by the statue of the terrible Dominican. The knife in his hand marks him out at once as "St. Peter Martyr," though few perhaps of our English tourists, and fewer still of the occupants of the "Via Guicciardini," have ever inquired why that statue was erected to the Grand Inquisitor. A few glaring cases of persecution gave Leopold the fitting opportunity of closing the ecclesiastical prisons and burning publicly the instruments of torture. There are, unfortunately, too many ways of making up for the loss of that Spanish enginery, but except in Rome, doomed to all that is exceptionable, the Inquisition *in the old form* exists nowhere in

Italy. The abolition of the Foro Ecclesiastico, and the subjection of the clergy to the civil law in common with other members of the State, and a few other measures of lesser importance, completed the defence which Leopold was so long constructing against Papal encroachment. The Siccardi laws in Piedmont, and the clerical censures on Santa Rosa, may give some idea of the value which Rome attaches to the Foro Ecclesiastico.

The internal reforms of the Church which Ricci carried out in his own diocese, and which Leopold resolved to introduce generally, were of too short duration to produce any very marked effect on the clergy or the people. Holding the opinions of the Jansenists, or at least the four points of the Gallican Church, Ricci denied of course the Papal infallibility, and maintained the right of bishops to hold synods in their own dioceses. He styled himself, in his pastoral letter convoking the famous synod of Pistoia (1786,) "bishop by the grace of God," omitting the usual *addendum* "and of the Holy See:" he treated the Limbo of infants as "a Pelagian fable," and Indulgences as a superstition: he advocated the use of only one altar in the church, the celebration of mass in the vulgar tongue, and the unveiling of images that were superstitiously venerated. These reforms, and the rigid discipline exercised on the friars, whose conduct was far from being edifying, excited the whole country against the "heretic" bishop. The synod of Pistoia was eminently successful, but the council of Florence, convoked the year following, came to quite an opposite conclusion on the "fifty-seven points," which Leopold, with the minuteness of a Sacristan, had submitted for discussion. A riot was excited in Prato, in Ricci's own diocese, against the innovations, the ostensible object of the uproar being to protect the altar of the cintola, or girdle of the Virgin Mary. The "riot of the Madonnas" was only part of a great scheme, and the unfortunate bishop was obliged to seek refuge elsewhere. For a time he was protected by the Grand Duke, but when Leopold assumed the purple of the Cæsars, on the death of the Emperor Joseph in 1790, the reaction could no longer be controlled. The demolished altars were rebuilt, the images veiled again, the companies re-established, the synod of Pistoia was condemned by the Pope, the bishop weakly recanted, though, like Galileo, he did not change his mind, and after years of persecution, and even imprisonment, "the Reformer of Catholicism in Tuscany" died broken-hearted at his villa of Rignano.

The work of Peter Leopold thus remained

unfinished, "like the Florence churches," and hence the partial success of his system. It is true the times were unpropitious, and the people opposed to the "berlicche berlocche" of their philosophic ruler. His own agents at times, and we might say very generally, favoured in secret the public disaffection. The only sincere reformer in the council of Regency, appointed on his removal to Vienna, was the senator Francesco Gianni, who in a few months was obliged to seek refuge, like Ricci, from the popular violence. Pompeo Neri, the jurist Rucellai, the auditor and authority on all ecclesiastical questions, and Angelo Tavanti, his oracle on finance, had all died before Leopold's removal. The Jesuit Summating, Leopold's confessor—for with strange inconsistency he chose a confessor from the society he had suppressed—was a principal agent in the reaction, especially in all matters connected with the Church. But besides, the whole system of Leopoldine reform, admirable as it was, and far in advance of anything that modern Italy had yet obtained, had been forced despotically on an unprepared and reluctant people; and when the directing hand had ceased to guide it, it stopped at once. The people had not risen to the mark of the legislator, and the laws had descended from the elevation of a philosophic despotism, instead of springing spontaneously from the advancing civilisation of a nation. Leopold had given no constitution, and had not always filled up the void made by his abolition of the laws of his Medicean predecessors. It is true he had a constitution *in petto*—a kind of Scotch Presbyterian regime for the government of the States by municipal councils, provincial councils, and a general assembly meeting annually, with the Grand-Duke for moderator. But that constitution "imagined by Peter Leopold" was never granted, and even Gianni's memoir, which has preserved the outline, was not published till long after the death of the prince. This singular memoir, written in 1805, remained as a dreary remembrance of an opportunity that had been allowed to pass, and as a protest against a return to the old Sanfedism.

The first years of FERDINAND III. were unpropitious. France was beginning to heave to the earthquake; and Italian princes felt the ground beneath them trembling. For fifteen years Ferdinand was an exile, and Florence had her courts of Bourbons and of French. Old Forsyth remarked in his day that the French occupation was the great epoch from which everything was reckoned—"avanti i Francesi"—"nei tempi dei Francesi"—"dopo i Francesi." The

French have certainly the merit of inaugurating a new era in Italy. The new impulse given to education and science, the great public works undertaken, the French system of taxation, the Code Napoleon, the suppression of convents, and the new regulation of the Church, were far in advance of the old miserable compound of priestcraft and despotism that constituted Italian government. Fossombroni presented to Napoleon a memoir in behalf of Tuscany, such as no other estate of the Peninsula could have presented, but for a time all Italy was constrained to succumb to "les idées Napoléoniennes." The French rule has left one or two traces on the Tuscan statute-book; but in the Restoration of 1805, though there were imperialists and liberals, the Leopoldine party prevailed, and Ferdinand III. preserved, though not in its integrity, the system of his father; and again when Leopold II., "now happily reigning," as the Court Almanac says, succeeded in 1824, he began his reign with an eulogy of his "immortal grandfather." And, first of all, the praise of preserving the traditional policy of the house of Lorraine, in the Grand-Ducal States, is due to the great Tuscan statesman of the day—that Fossombroni whose monument, a masterpiece of Bartolini, stands in Santa Croce among the tombs of the great Florentines; but a new liberalism was springing up in the universities, and among the more enlightened classes of the community, which required something more than a system stereotyped for nearly half a century; and among the higher ranks of the citizens there were men who advocated *progress*, that the government might keep pace with the growing civilisation of the country.

It would be unfair to measure the aristocratic liberals of Tuscany, such as the Marquis Gino Capponi, or Cosimo Ridolfi, with our English Whigs, or with the conservative Statesmen of a country that has had its parliament for centuries. Florence, first of all, and afterwards Tuscany, had been jealous of their national independence; but the citizens had scarcely ever enjoyed a fair measure of civil liberty, and even Fossombroni who defended the first so manfully, but very imperfectly comprehended the second. The whole habits of a people cannot be new-modelled in a day, and we do the constitutional party in Italy injustice when we test their measures by the perfection of that slow growth of centuries which is the glory of our British civilisation. And then we must take into account the element of the Papacy from which the Reformation happily delivered us. We were ready enough to sing "Io Pean," when Mazzini gave law

from the Capitol, instead of the Pope from the Vatican, and certainly so far the change was for the better; but the slow work of rooting out the deeply seated superstition of a Romanized population had still to begin. It was no great change on the mere materialism of worship when the Bambino of the Ara Coeli, the little miraculous wooden doctor of the Franciscans of the Capitol, made his rounds in the triumphal chariot of Leo. XII., and the devout Romans of the republic of 1849, shouted, "Viva il Bambino democratico!" or when Guerrazzi taught his applauding Livornesi that Christ was the highest model of a democrat. Standing between despotism on the one hand, and popular superstition or wild extravagance on the other, the Italian Liberals of the moderate party, like Count Balbo and Massimo d'Azeglio in Piedmont, or Gino Capponi in Tuscany, had no easy position to maintain against the two extremes; and though we believe that *their* system will never accomplish the moral regeneration of Italy, till it has reached a higher point than their party has yet aimed at, we would not on that account let loose the tide of French democracy, or inundate the Peninsula with the gospel of Lamennais.

But side by side with the moderate reformers rose the young Liberals of the universities, Guerrazzi, Salvagnoli, and Forti of Pescia, impatient of the slow and timid movements of the elders of their party. With these were associated the like-minded of the other states, such as Tommaseo, Leopardi, and Pietro Giordani, who had sought the freer atmosphere of Tuscany, or had been driven to seek it by the iron rule that prevailed elsewhere. The "*Autologia*"* of Florence was their "*Edinburgh Review*," giving utterance as boldly as it dared to the new ideas, till the government most imprudently silenced the ablest scientific and literary journal of Italy. Besides these, Tuscany had its poetic Liberalism, the great dramas of Niccolini, and the exquisite satires of Giusti. But the man who was destined to occupy the most prominent position was F. D. Guerrazzi, whose trial for high treason is now attracting so large a share of public attention in the Peninsula. The history of that Leghorn lawyer has been written in part at least by himself, and that little volume of "*Memorie*" addressed to Mazzini in 1849, notwithstanding its ridiculous pomposity, we think most valuable for its picture of the Italian democrat; we should

* This monthly review appeared first in 1821, and ceased in 1832. Among the contributors, besides those named above, were Ridolfi, Capponi, Inghirami, and Romagnosi.

like to dwell on that curious autobiography, tracing the gradual development of the "greater part of the family of mortal sins" in the character of the hopeful youth, till he became a student of Pisa, and saw Lord Byron, and read his poetry, for this makes one great epoch in the history. The wandering "Childe Harold" was then in Pisa—in popular estimation a spirit of evil in human form on some dark and mysterious errand to the children of men—but in the eyes of the wondering student, the very Apollo of the Vatican. Byron henceforth became "his master and his model." Banished for a time from the university for too keen an appetite for politics, and in after life closely watched by the police as a restless conspirator brooding dark schemes and plotting nobody knew what—dodged by the *gens d'armes*, for the paternal government *temporibus illis* kept a keen look out upon its subjects, and most kindly wished "every man quiet and peaceful with a wife and at least four children"—imprisoned once or twice on mere suspicion, and liberated again without knowing why or wherefore—and then banished again to Portoferraio, where he planned his romance on the Siege of Florence. Guerrazzi, in short, had laid up "capital" to be turned to account when opportunity should offer. His romance especially was a fierce defiance of the powers that were in those days; he "wrote a book because he could not fight a battle," and here is his picture of his own romance,—

"I thought it charity to ply all the torments used by the ancient tyrants and by the holy office, and to invent others still more atrocious to excite the sensibility of this land fallen into miserable lethargy; I wounded it, and poured into the wounds brimstone and burning pitch; I galvanized it, and God only knows the trembling anxiety with which I saw it open its closed eyes and move its livid lips. . . . I chose the part of Prometheus and wished to animate the statue, even though the vulture shall prey upon my vitals for ever."—(*Memorie*, pp. 94, 95.)

A taste for the tremendous—*le gout des émotions*—was sure to be gratified by that patriotic romance, and even the Queen Mab could hardly match the wild profanity of those which preceded or followed. A whirlwind to move the waters of the Lake Asphaltites—a blessing or a curse from heaven, it mattered little which, if Italy should live—and if not,—

"Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor!"

Such were the grand ideas of that school of Romanticism by which a new era was to be brought in. And are these the men who

are to dry the tears of the Niobe of nations? Are these the prophets of the future? To the credit of Mazzini we do not hold him accountable for the wild excesses of his party: there is a sublimity in his faith in the destinies of Italy that raises him above the mere reverses or successes of the moment—a poetry, a sentimentalism that refine and elevate the prophet of the "Republican one and indivisible"—an earnestness and devotion in his Pantheistic creed that set him far apart from the grosser materialists. But let the truth be freely told of all, and certainly the extremes in the Italian struggle were Despotism and Priestcraft on the one hand, with Democracy and Pantheism on the other.

We do not set forth Guerrazzi as a type of the Tuscan Liberal, though his book procured him such incredible popularity, that Gualterio speaks of it as marking an epoch in the history of the revolutionary movement. (*Rivolgimenti*, vol. ii. p. 52.) In fact Guerrazzi partakes more of the nature of the Sicilian or the Corsican* than of the refined and gentle Tuscan. The national character in the land of painting and of song has been softened down almost to effeminacy, and is sadly wanting in vigour and independence. In the Florentine, acute, polished, and graceful—true son of "la gentile Firenze"—the heroism of the old Republican has died away. He can raise a cenotaph to Dante, but "Dante sleeps afar" beside the pine trees of Ravenna, and his native city wants even the ashes of the stern old Ghibelline. That single city—the judgment is Mariotti's—has given birth to more great men than all the rest of the peninsula, but the tombs of Santa Croce are a poor defence against the brute force of the Austrian.

The "paternal Government" of LEOPOLD II., guided by Fossombroni, and afterwards by Don Neri Corsini, was occupied at first with the material improvement of the State. Infant schools, normal schools, the education of the deaf and dumb, savings banks, and the draining of the Maremma, were quite enough for a ministerial programme. Education was the mania, and it is but fair to mention Raphael Lambruschini, nephew of

* We give as an illustration the epitaph to his father's memory which Guerrazzi inscribed on the tablet under the portico of the church at Montenero:—

Hic intus
Francisci Guerratii
insontes cineres

Expectant postremum Dei judicium
Sine pavore.

His father he describes as a man of no religious profession.

the old illiberal Cardinal, as foremost in the work. Reforms of law and railways came later, but for a time Tuscany was turned into a kind of large academy. A grand *fiesta*, the meeting of the scientific congress at Pisa, the inauguration of a statue to Galileo, a magnificent discourse from Rosini, and a thousand other things, and Tuscany was quiet under her mild absolutism. The affairs of Rimini disturbed the frontiers a little in 1845, but "the manifesto of Rimini" was corrected and modified at Pisi, in the rooms of Montanelli, a professor of the university, and Renzi was allowed to pass through Tuscany when flying from the *sbirri* of old Pope Gregory. It is true when the Grand-Duke visited Rome in 1841, Gregory XVI. extorted some kind of promise that he would repeal at least some of the Leopoldine laws; but the minister, Don Neri Corsini, refused to sign any act that would mar the work of Peter Leopold, or change the traditional policy of the Palazzo Vecchio; and the Pope, in his allocution read in the next consistory of Cardinals, made bitter reference to the disappointment of his hopes, and to the slippery Grand-Ducal faith:—" *Sed celatissimus ille Dux quae nobis promisit non tenuit!*" (Gualterio, ii. 71.) Such promises were considered "more honoured in the breach than the observance;" and in those days Massimo d'Azeglio printed in Florence his fearful exposure of the Papal Government. But on the death of Don Neri Corsini, in 1845, when the Paver and Baldasseroni ministry came into power, a policy of approximation to Rome and Austria began. Even in 1846, when Rome suddenly became liberal, Tuscany was retrograding, and the Government seemed to have passed into the hands of the police at the Palazzo Non-Finito. The elements of a revolution were gathering on every side, but Leopold II. was blissfully unconscious: "il n'avait rien su, rien vu, rien prévu." It was not, however, the time precisely for concentrating all power in the person of the Grand-Duke. The enlightened Liberals of Florence—the Baron Ricasoli, the Marquis Gino Capponi, Cosimo Ridolfi, the advocate Salvagnoli, and others, had the courage to warn the Government of the impossibility of turning back the spirit of an enlightened age to the theories of the later Medici. In Pisa, Montanelli, mild, dreamy, and fantastic, now Mazzinian and democratic, and again Giobertian and theocratic, changing with every new idea that roused his fancy, was exercising a paramount influence on the youth of the University, and Guerrazzi was supreme in Leghorn. There was no liberty of association, of speech, of the press, and it was only

by papers clandestinely printed that the wants and demands of the people were made known. And these demands of the Tuscan Liberals were eminently moderate; the leaders of the movement in Florence were men of the highest education and character; the Pisan professor was of too pliant material to be much dreaded—wood perhaps for the manufacture of Mercury, but certainly not the block out of which to carve a Brutus. The Government at last gave way,* and granted Liberty of the Press, (May 1847.)

We have no intention of telling over again the old story of the Revolution. It was the same thing everywhere—the press, the civic guard, a constitution, Custoza, Novara, and the reaction. But two matters are important at present—the political career of that remarkable man whose trial in the Florence courts is now exciting an almost exclusive attention in Italy, and the claims of Tuscany generally on the gratitude and good faith of the Grand-Duke. After one or two liberal measures in 1847, the Marquis Cosimo Ridolfi became minister, and Tuscany kept pace in reform with the best of Italy. A constitution was solemnly granted in Feb. 15, 1848; then came the war and the cabinet of Gino Capponi. The Pisan students, with Montanelli at their head, had fought valiantly at Curtatone, where Montanelli had been wounded, and borne as a prisoner to the citadel of Mantua. The news of his death had been spread at home, and funeral honours decreed him, but having returned afterwards by an exchange of prisoners, his popularity was unbounded. But the Mazzinian agitation had begun, "the war of kings had ended," and Italy must henceforth trust to "the war of the people." A certain democratic orator, wonderfully gifted in his way—Padre Gavazzi may perhaps remember the name—reached Leghorn, declaimed, and was arrested; an uproar followed, and, finally, in September, the insurrection at Leghorn. To quiet the insurgent city Montanelli was appointed governor, and managed his affairs so well that in a month he had ousted the ministry, and, in company with

* Gualterio has devoted a whole chapter to Mr. Cobden's visit to Italy at this time. In Tuscany, the native ground of the Free Trade principles, the Academy of the Georgofili inscribed his name on their Album, where the name of Sir Robert Peel had been inscribed before. The ministers Paver and Baldasseroni took part in the public homage to the Free Trade agitator. When Cobden rose to give thanks for this honour, he certainly touched a point peculiarly suitable to the time:—"We succeeded," he said, "because a great minister had comprehended the duty of changing his opinion, and what is more honourable for him, had the courage to confess it." The eyes of the academicians were turned to Paver and Baldasseroni. (Gualterio, vol. v. p. 446.)

Guerrazzi, was in the cabinet at Florence, with war and the constituent for his programme. The "Apostolic Pilgrim" of Gaeta, however, anathematized the constituent, and the poor Grand-Duke, filled with spiritual terrors, consulted the Pope on his new position. The answer may be easily imagined, and the Grand-Duke himself, attached to the old paternal absolutism, had never liked the new ideas, and, following the pontifical example, fled to Gaeta.

The ministry resigned, and the scene that followed was a stirring one. In the Piazza of the old Florentine Signory—the scene of so many a drama, under the Loggia of Oragna, where the priors of the Republic had given way to the hired guards of the Medici, and where the Perseus of Cellini still stands sword in hand, holding up the head of the Medusa—the Circoli held their noisy meeting to decide on the affairs of State. They elected a Provisional Government, and appointed Guerrazzi, Montanelli and Mazzini ministers. We dare say the scene was quite as fine as any old Guelphic or Ghibelline triumph in the annals of Florence, but it lacks the halo of antiquity to make it imposing. Caesar Augustus, in a fashionable Parisian costume, or Dante dressed *à la mode*, would be sadly reduced in our imagination. We suppose, judged by the standard of our modern civilisation, even the godlike kings who fought at Troy would be about on a par with as many chiefs of American Indians fighting for a handsome squaw. Had the thing happened in our days, it would have been settled diplomatically by a *chargé d'affaires*; even Lord Palmerston would not have thought it necessary to send round the Channel fleet to the mouth of the Scamander, to put an end to a quarrel so disreputable, and the whole *matériel* of Homer's deathless Epic would have been condensed into a column of the *Times*. It is a comfort to think that these modern scenes will become grander as they get older.

The triumvirate—the Republic proclaimed at Leghorn—the decisive defeat at Novara—Guerrazzi dictator, and Montanelli sent to Paris—a dispute with Mazzini on the *unification* or fusion of Tuscany with Rome—a counter revolution in favour of the Grand-Duke—Guerrazzi in opposition, and at last sulkily giving in—the Grand-Duke recalled, and Guerrazzi imprisoned—Leghorn bombarded by the Austrians—the Grand-Duke's return in the uniform of an Austrian general—the reaction, imprisonments, and a trial *three years after*—such is the modern history of Tuscany.

But there are matters of more importance connected with this reaction than the trial of

Guerrazzi and his associates, and which demand the attention of the European governments.

And *first* of these is the threatened absorption of Tuscany into the Austrian empire. It would be tedious to follow the persevering attempts of Austria to make Tuscany a mere fief of the empire, or to appeal to the long list of treaties that establish its independence, from the Quadruple Alliance of 1718 down to the Treaty of Vienna in 1815, for the diplomacy of the Tuscan succession would fill a volume. But especially since the rival claims of Austria and Spain were adjusted by the treaties of 1765, (for we do not speak of the cession of Lorraine to France,) the preserving of the distinct independence of Tuscany, and its separation from Austria, has been the unvarying policy of the younger or Italian branch of the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine. Leopold I. maintained it firmly against the emperor Joseph, and when he himself was Kaiser, he adhered most scrupulously to his former policy. After the general overturn of the continental governments, and in the re-organization of 1815, Tuscany was fortunate in having such men as Fossombroni and Don Neri Corsini to defend its ancient rights "against all deadly;" and if treaties are of any value, the 100th article of the Treaty of Vienna put the independence of Tuscany under the safeguard of the great powers of Europe. Yet even this did not prevent new attempts of the Imperial Cabinet on the autonomy of the weaker State, and especially in 1824, on the death of Ferdinand III., the Austrian minister at Florence was directed to concert with the heir of the Crown the terms of the proclamation announcing his accession, and thus, to maintain the appearance of feudal rights in the Grand-Duchy, Count Bombelles went accordingly to the Arch-Duke Leopold, but was received instead by Fossombroni, *as minister of the new sovereign*. The ambassador, disconcerted by this reception, announced that he was sent to the *Arch-Duke Leopold*, but Fossombroni replied that he was authorized by *His Imperial and Royal Highness the Grand-Duke Leopold II.*, to receive any communication made to him as Secretary of State. The Austrian diplomatist was *not* in fact received by the heir of the Crown, and the next morning, the same proclamation that announced the death of Ferdinand, announced also the accession of Leopold II.

Since the restoration of 1849, in direct opposition to the policy of a century, and to the spirit, at least, of the general law of Europe, as established by the Treaty of Vienna, Tuscany has been a garrison of

Austrian troops. Let it be remembered that the forcing of the *constituent* on a Constitutional Sovereign was the work of a noisy minority—that the democratic ministry and the dictatorship fell in less than six months after their formation, and that the Grand-Duke was recalled by the acclamation of the people: and on what plea was that convention between the cabinets of Florence and Vienna for the occupation of Tuscany by Austrian troops signed in the April of 1850? The Tuscan Court would perhaps have preferred a restoration by force to the spontaneous movement of the people: certainly Rome and Naples would have considered it more *à la mode*: but when Leghorn had yielded to the troops of Baron d'Aspre, and the overwhelming majority of the Tuscans desired to settle down under the constitutional regime, on what plea is a land professedly independent still trodden down by the feet of the Austrian soldiery? Is the spirit of the treaties of 1815 to be violated, that Austria may sit like an incubus on the Italian peninsula, and that the heir of the "Holy Roman Empire" may not only abolish the wise and tolerant laws of the Emperor Joseph in the Empire itself, but also enable the scarlet despotism of the seven hills to remove the ancient landmarks which the legislature had set up in Italy itself against its exorbitant pretensions. Austria is thus consolidating her power in unfortunate Italy, and everywhere in favour of despotism and priestcraft: and the only plea that can be urged is this, that the restored governments of 1849 have become so *intolerable* that they cannot exist without the protection of the Austrian bayonets. England cannot look on carelessly, and that commercial treaty which the Cabinet of Vienna (if the rumor be true) is attempting to force on prostrate Tuscany, may yet teach her that her own interests are concerned in demanding that the Austrian troops should be withdrawn from a kingdom which the general law of Europe has recognised as independent. Something has been already done in this way when the able diplomatist now at Florence retrieved the singularly mismanaged Mather business, but *that* was a slight matter to the English interests that will be involved, if Tuscany be virtually absorbed by Austria.

Again, the whole Leopoldine legislation is in danger of being overthrown, and civilized Tuscany reduced to the model of Naples and the Pontifical States. We shall not waste time in noticing the miserable intrigues of the agents of the Papal Camerilla to induce the weak and superstitious Leopold II. to undo the whole work of the

former princes of his house. We have sketched as fully as our space would permit the Leopoldine system under which Tuscany had prospered for a century: but we may allude again to its three great principles according to the definition of the Tuscan jurists. 1st, Laicity of the State, *i.e.*, its independence of Papal control. 2d, Equality of all in face of the law; and, 3d, Economic liberty. Or let us state these principles more fully, so as to convey an adequate idea of a system that is connected with the whole civil life of the people, that comes home to their bosoms and business, and touches their interests every hour. The neutrality and distinct political independence of the State: liberty of conscience: civil emancipation of the Jews, and subjects not Catholic: a mild criminal code with public trial of the accused: equality of taxation, and the abolition of municipal immunities: the nomination of bishops by the State, and the Exequatur as a defence against Romish aggression: the suppression of the *Foro Ecclesiastico*, of the Inquisition, and of the Jesuits: the mortmain laws and abolition of entails: the regulation of conventual discipline: municipal liberties, and a constitution "looming in the future." Such is the system that in the middle of the nineteenth century, and in a kingdom civilized beyond any in Italy, is in danger of being abolished that Tuscany may swarm with monks and friars as in the palmy days of Cosmo de Medici.

It is right to state that the agents in these intrigues are Lucchese. That little Duchy of Lucca, incorporated with Tuscany in 1847 on the death of Maria Louisa of Parma, had not partaken of the Leopoldine reforms; and has now furnished agents, of whose character the less we say the better, to do the work of the not very scrupulous Court of Rome. The abolition of the laws emancipating the Jews, entire priestly control in the matter of education, and the free action of the Church according to the old regime, were the first matters proposed: and even at present the Jewish liberties *have* been curtailed by the abolition of the constitution; schools and teachers *have* been entirely subjected to the control of the clergy by the late law on education, and by the concordat of April 1851, the Church has made the first grand step towards resuming all its former privileges. The Concordat was professedly a mere instalment, and yet it establishes the complete freedom of the clergy in their ministry, and the publications relating thereto, and in their communications with the Holy See. Bishops were left at full liberty henceforth to commit

the Lent preachings and missions generally to whomsoever they pleased; and, besides, the censorship of books treating *ex professo* of religious matters, and the authority of prohibiting to the faithful the reading of any book whatsoever, were committed to the four Archbishops of Florence, Pisa, Lucca, and Siena, the sixteen bishops, and their enlightened, liberal, and tolerant clergy. The subject of marriage belonged of course to the canon law. And the fifteen articles of this Concordat of the 25th of April were agreed on and signed by Cardinal Antonelli, and the minister Baldasseroni, at the very time when Piedmont, having passed the Siccardi Laws, was preparing to erect the very bulwarks that Tuscany had thrown down. The first great step then has already been made towards the abolition of the whole system of Peter Leopold: the ultimate aim, from which the Papal Court has never for one moment deviated since the days of Pius VI., being to re-establish the old mortmain, the ecclesiastical immunities, the Inquisition, and the Jesuits! A comprehensive programme this for 1852! To the honour even of the Baldasseroni and Laudicci ministry, be it said, that they have hitherto resisted these last proposals, and the Lucchese agent of the Papacy has been dismissed for the time from the Cabinet; but unless the representatives of such great powers as are still free interfere to protect the sacred rights of a whole people, or another revolution shake the central seat of continental despotism, Tuscany is now too feeble to defend the laws to which her sovereign was sworn.

The *third* point which we notice is the entire abolition of the constitution of February 15th, 1848. It is needless now to appeal to the oath of the Prince, or to the solemn promise given verbally by Leopold II. to the Tuscan deputies at Gaeta, and afterwards repeated in the proclamation of the 1st of May 1849, to preserve and to develop the constitutional regime he had instituted. The great example of political immorality had been already given by Pius IX. Austria, too, has set aside without compunction the constitution of the 4th of March, and, unfortunately, examples are but too abundant; and yet we are justified in citing the case of Tuscany as the most glaring. We exclude France, of course, which as becomes an original, independent, and free thinking nation, never condescends to follow any stereotyped course or ecclesiastical canon for making oaths and breaking them. In Italy, however, there is a plain, ordinary, Macadamized road, by which reactionary princes invariably

travel. But let it be remembered that what Tuscany sought was not Democracy, (we except the few now under process, and their adherents,) but constitutional government. The Medici themselves had not abolished the old "Council of Two Hundred," and "Senate of Forty," which represented the popular element; and the first Leopold, had the times been propitious, would have extended that representation to the whole State. Before the reforms of 1848, during a hundred and ten years, the Austrian Grand-Dukes and the French had introduced and promoted a new civilization, and it cannot be said of the Tuscan people that they are now unfit for constitutional government. They are educated and intelligent, temperate and moderate: they have been accustomed to municipal forms, and they have a history and traditions of greatness, and a name imperishable in the annals of Italy; and with all these claims, their cities must be guarded by foreign soldiers who cannot speak their language, and their every movement watched by spies and the police. That system of spies and informers, above all, tends to corrupt and demoralize, and by none of the Italian dynasties has it been plied more perseveringly than by the princes of Lorraine. Even Leopold I. spent enormous sums on spies; it was a taste of his family, and his Austrian mother kept spies on *him*; and it is notorious that Leopold II., who keeps his subjects under such infamous *surveillance*, is himself watched on behalf of Austria. There is no free press—no liberty of speech—suspicion and distrust prevail; and cases are but too well known in which the priest has divulged the secret of the confessional, the wife "informed" upon her husband, and the father on his child. And through the ever-watchful police, imprisonments take place, and cases are gravely tried on the most ridiculous pretences. We shall merely cite one such case. A confectioner of Siena had prepared in the materials of his "calling" a figure of Italy, and adorned it with the three national colours—a fine thing for children to look at in the cook-shop window! The confectioner was cited before the tribunals, and "the great gingerbread case" became famous among the lawyers of Siena. There was no law, however, on the statute-book that made a parti-coloured cake offensive to the Grand-Duke, his "crown and dignity;" and the confectioner, triumphantly acquitted, was allowed henceforth to work out his politics in pastry.

We know not in what terms to describe the infatuation with which Leopold II. seems

to be hastening on in the destruction of all that was noble in his dominions. The trade of Leghorn has been sacrificed to a league with Rome, and when commerce has diminished the Government begins to enlarge the port. The Universities of Pisa and Siena have been sacrificed also—their chairs suppressed, that money may be saved to pay the Austrians. One journal still free protested indignantly against each vandalism, and was suspended, and finally suppressed. But unhappily this is not the worst. It is not our purpose here to speak of those religious persecutions for which in these late days Tuscany has been distinguished: yet let us state the great leading facts in reference to the origin at least of such persecutions. The reforms of Leopold I. and of Scipio de Ricci were in advance of their age, and yet they were by no means unproductive. The Church of Rome was kept in check, and education of a more large and liberal kind, as it supplanted the miserable priestly tutorship, not only destroyed in the minds of the people the absurd superstitions against which Ricci strove in vain, but also led them on in the search for truth. And that educational movement of which Raphael Lambruschini was the head, could not fail to prepare the way for something more than its promoters had dreamed of at the first. The Bible, the great enlightener, made its way into Tuscany; and many years ago, a few Florentines, and among them Count Piero Guicciardini, forsook the Papal system for simple belief in the Word of God. It was no question of churches or church government with these few earnest men; it was not even a question of Protestantism or Popery, but simply of Bible teaching—"What saith the Lord?" And hence their unwillingness to give any merely negative character to their creed, and their prejudice, very natural in Italy, though somewhat unreasonable, against the name of "Protestant." The first year of revolution was a time of feverish political excitement, when the masses were too much occupied with the stirring events of the day to have much time left for calm and sober and earnest study of religious truth. But at that brief season of unbounded liberty, or of anarchy, the Bible spread over all Italy; it was printed in Florence, and in Rome itself. But after Novara the reaction came with its atrocities, and the voice of the "Holy Father" who had blessed the banners of the Italian armies, was lifted up in anathema against that very movement to which he himself had given the first impulse. Pius IX. regained his throne, but lost all

moral power in Italy. A system of which he was the head and chief could scarcely be infallible. The Bible was opened and studied earnestly; and the result, especially in Florence, has been the entire abandonment of Roman Catholicism by hundreds of the population. The law documents before us, to go no further, attest it as a notorious fact that the principles of Protestantism, or of the Bible, have spread almost in every town of Tuscany. An attempt was made to crush this rising spirit of inquiry, but the very effort to prevent inquiry had, as usual, the effect of adding all the *zest* of prohibition to a subject that had already excited so strong an interest on its own account. The circulation of the Bible was declared illegal, but it spread more widely than before. A few Bible readers were imprisoned, and a few others banished, and the interest increased; and now there can scarcely be less than two thousand people in Florence, who adhere to the word of God alone as their rule of faith. No charge has been brought against them of political partisanship, or of disloyalty to the sovereign; and if one thing is better established than another in connexion with this Tuscan movement in favour of the pure gospel, it is this, that it has nothing to do with politics. The calm, mild, and dignified Guicciardini was no agitator, as all Florence knows, yet he is an exile for conscience' sake. In Malta, in Piedmont, in the Swiss valleys, there are banished men of Tuscany, who have been driven there for the sake of God's own word, "to taste the savour of other people's bread." In the prisons of Lucca and Volterra—we have the law documents before us—there are cells of the "condemned," and sufferers against whom no other charge has been brought than this, that they read and believed, or taught the Bible. And much more that these documents have not brought to light we might disclose of the measures that have been taken to gratify the resentment of a priestly party, who feel that their power is departing from them.

But to one fact we would call special attention; in these laws and measures affecting the Church, Tuscany is but going hand in hand with Austria. In the empire, the Josephine laws since 1781, like the Leopoldine laws in the weaker state, were unfavourable to Romish pretensions: the two sons of Maria Theresa pursued the same system; but the new laws from Vienna on the 18th and 23d of April 1850, abolishing the *Placet*, or, in other words, annulling the *Exequatur*, and those other measures which have followed in quick succession for the last two years, are undermining the whole legis-

lation of Joseph II. It is a singular fact that Austria, the most unbending and uncompromising supporter of the old *status quo*, that knows no progress and admits no change, should yet in the Imperial Cabinet effect a revolution of her own in favor of the Papacy. The heir of the Holy Roman Empire, and the occupant of the chair of Hildebrand, have leagued themselves together for a common struggle. Their interests are now one, and they must stand or fall together; and their joint aim is to enslave the bodies if they cannot enslave the souls of men. Austria invokes the spiritual terrors which in other days Rome could use so well, and Rome entrusts the defence of her tottering throne to the strong arm of the Croat and the Slaav. France may be the eldest daughter, and may get a kind of hesitating compliment at times, for in truth she has been a wayward child, but Austria is "the sword of the Church." At the head of the new crusade against the minds and consciences of men are the Princes of Hapsburg and Lorraine. But let not the continental rulers think that they can continue a system of government in opposition to the intelligence of a people, or corrupt with impunity the conscience of their subjects. Those old idols of the Papacy that bigotry or priestcraft is dressing up again—those painted Madonnas that are winking at Rimini most knowingly, or working miracles at Florence, are sadly out of date. The monks and friars and meritorious mendicants, redolent of every odour but that of sanctity, have become almost an anachronism even in the south, and they might be left to die out peaceably. We are not iconoclasts in the grosser sense. We would deprecate as loudly as any the turning of Vallombrosa into a cotton factory; and as for those fat old fathers of Camaldoli, so hospitable and so fond of snuff, we would not "pull down their nests" about their ears, especially as the disciples of St. Romuald are robed in white, and even our northern metaphysics could scarcely make them out to be "the crows" of a monkish rookery. But we think, in Tuscany, the time has gone by for such things, unless the present efforts of the Papacy succeed in bringing back that "gross darkness" which is their proper element. The fanaticism of the Flagellanti has not been revived—the Knights of Malta exist as yet but in name and tradition; and the Jesuits, like witches by a "running stream," are standing on the bank, but have not crossed the Arno. To force the institutions of the worst times of the Papacy on a comparatively civilized people, against their mind and conscience, is but an idle effort at

the best; and to darken and deprave a nation with the idea of making them more peaceful and submissive to both Church and State, is of all expedients the most mistaken. A people without the fear of God will not continue long to honour the king; and if we mistake not the signs of the times, there is a terrible retribution coming to those Continental rulers who have used their power in crushing the conscience of their subjects. An infidel spirit is spreading fast and far among those who cannot as rational men believe the lying legends of the Church of Rome, and who do not seek guidance in the Word of inspiration—a daring and God-defying spirit that makes small account of law either human or divine; and if we mistake not, with this rising infidelity, both despotism and Popery must soon strive hand to hand. *Dies iræ dies illa?*

Yet it is perhaps better that the constitution of February has been finally and fully abolished, than that it should exist only in name. It has brought out more distinctly the true state of things, both as to the measures and the men. The once popular Leopold II., and his patriot oath, have become a byword among his people, and we cannot refrain from quoting one stanza of the "Casa Guidi Windows," which perhaps, on the whole, the Grand Duke might consider as slightly personal.

"Why swear at all, thou false Duke Leopold?
What need to swear? What need to boast thy blood
Taintless of Austria, and thy heart unsold
Away from Florence? It was understood
God made thee not too vigorous or too bold,
And men had patience with thy quiet mood,
And women pity, as they saw thee pace
Their festive streets with premature grey hairs:
We turned the mild dejection of thy face
To princely meanings, took thy wrinkling cares
For ruffling hopes, and called thee weak, not base.
Better to light the torches for more prayers,
And smoke the pale Madonnas at the shrine,
Being still 'Our poor Grand Duke,' 'Our good
Grand Duke,'
'Who cannot help the Austrian in his line,'
Than write an oath upon a nation's book
For men to spit at with scorn's blurring brine!
Who dares forgive what none can overlook?"

The decree that abolished the *Statuto* dissolved of course that party who had clung to the faded rag of a constitution as the banner under which they were to fight. The two parties are now ABSOLUTISM and DEMOCRACY;—the princes themselves have destroyed, or are fast destroying, that great party who sought to harmonize the rights of the crown with the interests of the people. Should another revolution come,—and who can tell what a day may bring forth!—there can scarcely be a constitutional party, for, with the exception of Sardinia, there are no

constitutions. The intelligent, enlightened, and liberal advocates of progress are thus made over to Mazzini, and the Italian rulers are doing more to increase his partisans than all the agents of his Central Committee. These reactionary sovereigns must reap the fruit of their own misdoings. If Leopold II., like Charles-Albert or Victor-Emmanuel, had maintained the free institutions he had founded, then, in the event of another attempt to overturn his throne, we believe all Tuscany—(with the single exception of Leghorn, for which we would not like to answer in any such contingency)—would have rallied round the house of Hapsburg-Lorraine: but now when the oath “written on a nation’s book” has been shamelessly broken—the pact between prince and people destroyed—the liberty of conscience outraged—the civilisation of a century threatened—however we deplore the struggle that is inevitable, we have but small respect for a nation of crouching slaves, and honour the men of stout heart and strong arm who stand up for their homes and their household gods. And such men there are even in Italy. From Leopold II. little can be expected; for, even excluding his whole Florentine *entourage*, his Austrian relations on the one hand, and his Neapolitan on the other, and above all the influence of Rome acting on his feeble character, have placed him almost beyond the possibility of recovering the position he has lost. But there is much to give hope in the growing intelligence of Tuscany. We do not speak at all of the unfortunate prisoners of the Revolution of 1848–49, who are now under trial in the courts. We cannot sympathize with the attempt then made to overthrow the constitution in favour of a mere fraction of the people. But let them be fairly tried, not by new laws nor by old, but by the laws which existed at the time, in short, by the Constitution with the fulness of its liberties. We do not think the volumes that have been written in their defence have made out a good case in their behalf; and it is humiliating to find such a man as Guerrazzi urging the plea, that while acting ostensibly as Dictator in a democracy he was privately intriguing to bring back the Sovereign! It would have been far nobler to have adhered firmly and manfully to the principle of a republic “one and indivisible,” than to have elaborated such a portrait of himself as a mere shuffling intriguer. While we pity the fallen, we cannot sanction the rascally division they created when Tuscany was advancing towards full constitutional liberty; or the occasion they furnished, and the plea they gave, to a reac-

tionary party to annul those liberties which had been granted and abused.

We know not *how far* the influence of England might yet make itself felt in the affairs of Italy, but the firm remonstrances of a great power, and some appearance of determination to uphold those treaties with which British interests are connected, might prevent more evils than we yet dream of. We have an accomplished and liberal diplomatist at Florence, but he must abide by the instructions of his Government, and Lord Malmesbury, at least, needs the spur of public opinion. The atrocities of Messina were checked by our ships of war in the Mediterranean, no doubt much to the annoyance of certain “allied and friendly” powers;—but as long as Italy remains in its present condition, we are untrue to our own interest and our own character, if we are not in opposition to all retrograde measures. Our ships of war hovering about the coast of Italy are “a terror to evil doers” in the lower part of the Peninsula, and especially to the Court of Rome, that would urge on the *subject States* to any measure of reaction in favour of the Papacy—

“Gens inimica mihi Tyrrhenum navigat æquor.”

ART. IV.—1. *Corneille et son Temps; Etude Littéraire.* Par M. GUIZOT. Paris: Didier. 1852.

(*Corneille and His Times.* By M. GUIZOT. London: Bentley. 1852.)

2. *Shakspeare et son Temps; Etude Littéraire.* Par M. GUIZOT. Paris: Didier. 1852.

(*Shakspeare and His Times.* By M. GUIZOT. London: Bentley. 1852.)

ONE looks at these volumes with mingled feelings of pleasure and pity. As the elegant productions of an able and scholarly mind they could not but be welcome at any time; yet in the fact of their appearance at present there is enough to awaken sad thoughts. A few years ago the author had no leisure for such things: the cares of a nation were upon him, and his hands were deep in civil intrigues and distractions. A blast of French impatience, or, as some believe, of something stronger and better, blew the system with which he was associated to pieces; and for a while he had his place among our noted exiles. Farther

changes have permitted him to return to France; but these changes have carried France still farther from the situation to which his policy belongs, and it is difficult to foresee that any turn of affairs will bring the country again into a state in which he shall be as prominent in the national politics as he was. In these circumstances, M. Guizot, with a resigned spirit of industry which does him honour, has betaken himself once more to the literary pursuits of his youth. All the world must be glad of it. There are differences of opinion as to the political merits of M. Guizot; there is no difference of opinion as to his literary talent. He ought to be a favourite author everywhere, and particularly with Englishmen. More solid, accurate, and austere than most of his countrymen, yet highly gifted with that spirit of scientific generality, that tendency to express truths in comprehensive forms, for which the French are remarkable, and of which the English, as some think, have too little, he is precisely the man to exercise a beneficial influence over English readers at the same time that he pleases them. Of all his works known to us, his *History of Civilization in France* deserves the highest praise in this respect. It is a book to be read and read again, not only as a compendium of rich matter relative to the progress of Europe in general, and of France in particular, during the middle ages, but also as an admirable specimen of the scientific mode of treating history. If M. Guizot gives us more such books now, we shall not regret that he has ceased to be an active politician.

The works before us are republications, with a few changes and additions, of essays published long ago. The pieces which form the volume on Corneille were published as early as 1813, when the author was only twenty-six years of age. They consist of an essay on the state of poetry in France before Corneille; an essay on the life and works of Corneille; and sketches, prepared by the late Madame Guizot, but revised by her husband, of three of Corneille's contemporaries, Chapelain, Rotrou, and Scarron. The volume on Shakspeare consists of an essay on the life and works of Shakspeare, published in 1821, and historical and critical notices of sixteen of Shakspeare's plays; with which is incorporated a review of the state of the dramatic art in France in 1830, written by M. le duc de Broglie on the occasion of the representation on the French stage of Alfred de Vigny's translation of Othello. The two volumes together may be considered as furnishing M. Guizot's confession of faith

in poetical matters, particularly as regards the drama.

We must confess that we have found both the volumes less interesting than we expected. We use the word "interest" advisedly. A plea in behalf of "the interesting" in literature seems to us to be much needed at the present time. We would lay it down as a canon that no book can be good that is not (in its kind, and in relation to those who are intellectually competent to its matter) *interesting*. This might seem a truism, were it not practically denied every day by the timidity of our critical judgments. There are many books which pass as good ones, and are praised, as deep, solid, and what not, notwithstanding that they are, nay, in some cases, possibly just because they are, transcendently uninteresting. If the style is dull; if there are no gleams of light, no sallets, no brisk allusions; if the matter does not stand out above the surface in clear shape and relief, but only peeps forth here and there, suggesting something amorphous underneath—then, forsooth, the book is a deep one, and the author is a man of heavy metal! People ought to have courage to resist this fashion, and never praise a book that does not interest them. No one is *entitled* to praise a book that does not interest him. True, on the other hand, one is not entitled to *dispraise* a book simply because it does not interest *him*. But to the right kind of reader no good book is dull; and, the right kind of reader being supposed,—that is, a reader intellectually competent to the intrinsic matter of the book, whatever it is,—then, if a book is dull, it is not a good one. We maintain that this canon will sweep the whole range of interesting books from Kant to Pickwick, and fail in no one case. Let it then be made absolute. Let it be insisted on that every book shall be interesting, shall have as much of the merit of literary fascination as the conditions of its subject will permit. For, after all, it will be found that this very quality of interest, so far from being attainable only at the expense of what is intrinsic, actually increases in proportion as the claims of the intrinsic are attended to; and that, of any two books on a given subject, the one which satisfies most strictly the deepest conditions of the subject, will also touch most keenly the nerves and the humanities. Even in the "thrilling" interest of novelists such as Eugene Sue, depending as that does in part on the reckless audacity with which, in their coarse fashion, they tear in among the topics of greatest social import and the most agitating to the people, there is, we

believe, a lesson for higher literature, could it only be expounded and seen into. On the other hand, such a work as that containing Niebuhr's investigations into early Roman history, of extraordinary merit as these are, would, we believe, have been all the better, even in its own order, if it had been more readable.

In hardly any class of books are there such easy elements of interest for cultivated readers as in the delightful and increasing class to which the works under notice belong. It would be difficult for stupidity itself to make a literary biography totally uninteresting. There are always, in such a case, anecdotes, extracts, and scraps of miscellaneous information, which it costs little trouble to put together, and which serve to amuse. Interest of this kind, therefore, one might have expected from any writer, and especially from any French writer, that should have undertaken to prepare a work, either on Corneille and his times, or on Shakspeare and his times. It would have been difficult for any writer, in such a case, not to have resuscitated some of the humours of the courts of Richelieu and King James. But, when a writer of M. Guizot's powers undertook to furnish the world with two such literary monographs, it was natural to expect a still higher order of interest. In addition to anecdote, extract, antique reminiscence, and sketches of the society of Paris and London in the seventeenth century, one might have looked for profound criticism, accurate portraiture of individuals, original combinations and interpretations of facts, and fine displays of historic insight. After such a writer had "done" Corneille and his times in a volume for the market, one might have expected that that portion of the literary history of France would thenceforth be seen as a defined circle of clear light in the distance of the French past, with all the chief figures of the time distinctly moving in it, and Corneille most distinct in the midst. And though as much could hardly have been demanded from his treatment of the English subject, Shakspeare being a phenomenon which it does not seem to be given to Frenchmen to understand, yet, that his picture would have conveyed to his countrymen some vivid idea of the traits of the "great Williams," as Dumas calls our Swan, and some deep appreciation of English poetry in general, is what might have fairly been anticipated.

These expectations, as we have said, are not fully answered. The books are, indeed, decidedly superior, as books go; and, if we remember the time at which they were writ-

ten, our estimate of them must be farther enhanced. But, tried by the standard of M. Guizot's reputation, and the capabilities of the subjects, they are somewhat below the mark. Our complaint against them is, that they are not so interesting as they might have been; by which, according to our definition of the word interesting, we mean that they are not the best specimens of M. Guizot's great and peculiar powers.

The volumes certainly contain a great deal of information, pleasant in itself, and collected with considerable pains from authentic sources. That on Corneille, in particular, will, in this respect, be interesting to English readers, whose knowledge of the life and writings of the French tragic poet is necessarily more limited than that of his admiring countrymen. The *mélange* of facts, anecdotes, quotations, and sketches of old Parisian celebrities of the days of Richelieu, given in this volume, will accordingly be very agreeable to such readers among us as are fond of literary history and literary gossip. Even here, however, owing perhaps to M. Guizot's comparative deficiency in that light *esprit* for which Frenchmen of much less ability are remarkable, and which enables them to catch up the humours of a period, and tell them with ease and point, there is more dulness than might have been expected. Much of the information is presented rather in the form to which we used to be accustomed in such dry books as Wharton's History of Poetry, than in the form which the better art of Macaulay, Scott, and other historians of antique literature has now made common. The essay on Poetry in France before Corneille, is indeed full of a kind of interest which Wharton never reaches; but this arises from the critical skill with which the development of the poetic style in France is traced through its successive representatives, De Lorris, De Meun, Marot, Ronsard, and Malherbe, to its maturity in Corneille, rather than from any special liveliness in matter and anecdote. Madame Guizot's portion of the volume is, in this respect, better than her husband's; her sketch of the poor cripple Scarron and his household is, in particular, very touching and graceful. So also, curiously enough, the most lively part of the volume on Shakspeare is the review of the French stage, and of the performance of Othello before a French audience, contributed by M. de Broglie. The remainder of the volume will, indeed, have the same fortunate advantage, as regards French readers, that the volume on Corneille has, as regards English readers—its information will be for the most part new. In the essay on the life and writings

of Shakspeare, for example, the French reader will find accumulated for him all the common stories of the poet's deer-stealing, horse-holding, &c., of which we in this country have got tired, together with many facts relating to the English Theatre of the days of Elizabeth; while, in the appended criticisms on Shakspeare's plays, there are admirable summaries of the original tales from which the poet borrowed his plots, with references to the probable books from which he took them. All this must be interesting to Frenchmen, who are not so Shakspeare-mad as we, and whom more meagre materials than any writer now dare bring to us about our idol will satisfy. What kind of facts M. Guizot relates to his countrymen about the hard of Avon may be judged from the following specimens:—

"In 1586 he (Shakspeare's father) was superseded in his functions as alderman, which he had already for a long time ceased to discharge. Other causes besides poverty may have contributed to his removal. It has been said that Shakspeare was a Catholic: it appears at least certain that such was the creed of his father; for, in 1770, a slater, in repairing the roof of the house in which Shakspeare was born, found, between the timber work and the tiles, a manuscript, placed there doubtless at a time of persecution, and containing a profession of the catholic faith, in fourteen articles, all commencing with these words, 'I, John Shakspeare.'"—*Shakspeare et son Temps*, p. 21.

"Shakspeare was not fifteen years old when he was taken away from school to aid his impoverished father in his business. It must have been then that, according to the tradition of Aubrey, William exercised the bloody functions connected with the trade of a butcher. This supposition is now revolting to the commentators of the poet; but a circumstance related by Aubrey hardly permits of doubt on the point, and reveals, at the same time, this young imagination even then incapable of submitting to vile employments without attaching to them some idea, some sentiment, ennobling them. 'When he killed a calf,' Aubrey was told by the country people of the neighbourhood, 'he would do it in a high style, and make a speech,' ('Il le faisait avec pompe et prononçait un discours.') Who does not see the tragic poet inspired by the spectacle of death, were it but that of an animal, and seeking to render it imposing or pathetic? Who does not figure to himself the scholar of thirteen or fourteen years, his head full of his first literary acquisitions, his mind struck, perhaps, by some theatrical representation, elevating, in a poetic transport, the animal he was about to strike, to the dignity of a victim, or, perhaps, even of a tyrant."—*Ibid.* pp. 22, 23.

What our Colliers and our Halliwells will say to the first of these stories (Guizot in this volume gives no references to authorities) we do not know. The controversy as

to the religion of Shakspeare's father is familiar to every one; but the episode of the slater is new to us. We wonder if the manuscript was in old Mr. Shakspeare's own handwriting, as that would be of some importance in connexion with another controversy, the existence of which M. Guizot does not seem to be aware of. Altogether the story is worth its weight in gold, and biographers are fools not to have made more use of it. Fancy the glimpse it gives into the household of the old alderman of Stratford, the father of "nine, ten, or perhaps even eleven children," as M. Guizot has somehow ascertained, William being "the third or fourth," and the first boy! There must have been stuff in an old fellow, (more wit than courage though,) who, when a storm of persecution was blowing, fell upon the notable device of writing out his profession of faith, or getting it written out for him, and then poking it into a hole in the roof of the house for posterity to find—thus at once protecting his skin, saving his conscience, and enjoying a joke. The story, you see, is the most likely in the world. And then so like his son, too! Did not Shakspeare the younger do exactly the same thing? Did he not also take the precaution of depositing his real profession of faith in the roof of a house, so that posterity might discover it in due time; and has not a slater been and gone the other day to the hiding-hole, and found out that Shakspeare was an Atheist?

The story of the calf, too, what a new turn M. Guizot has given to it! The story in Aubrey is, that he, gleaning information from among the country people about Stratford, some thirty or forty years after Shakspeare's death, heard that, when the poet was a boy (*i.e.*, some eighty years before) he used to assist his father in his trade as a butcher, and that when he killed a calf he did not do it like anybody else, but with a flourish and an oration. To a dull English imagination, this story, taking it for true, is rather humorous than otherwise. One sees the young poet, with his knife in his right hand, and his left on the neck of a calf, not proceeding in a stolid butcherly way to kill the animal without sharing the pleasure with any one else, but turning first to the boys and girls gathered round him in the backyard, and, with that gift of fluency which he always possessed, improving the occasion with a speech. The speech, we fancy, might pretty frequently run thus: "Here is a calf; cutlets are necessary; I'll kill the calf—I'll kill him." This would be when he felt the full flurry of the moment; but sometimes he might be more staid and theatrical—"Ye boys of Stratford, lo! I kill a calf;" and sometimes

pathos might predominate, and there would be an allusion to the feelings of the calf's mother. So we fancy the incident, always supposing that it ever happened. But the imagination of M. Guizot is more reverent. In his picture of the incident one sees no such vulgar boy as Stratford, but a white-robed young flamen with upturned eyes, performing solemnly an act of sacrifice, or a juvenile Brutus enacting in thought the part of a stern tyrannicide. This, we take it, is French imagination, imagination *à la mode Française*.

Our readers will pardon us for taking note, rather too distinctly as it may seem, of these trifles. We do not think them trifles. There is too strong a tendency among our biographers to catch up any stories, probable or not, that may come in their way as they seek for matter for their volumes; and though we have learnt, we trust, to keep this habit in check, and to treat tradition more rigorously in our biographies of Shakspeare, there is no safeguard, unless it be in ridicule from this side of the water, against the currency for a long time to come of such loose *Shakspeariana* in France. If Guizot offends in this respect, what are we to expect from other Frenchmen who may write about the "great Williams?" Besides, in the second of the two cases mentioned, there is a deeper reason for special notice. In the curious sentimental transmutation to which Aubrey's story—a story with which we have no other quarrel than that it wants authentication—is treated when it passes into Guizot's mind, we see traces of a radical defect of view which appears and reappears throughout the whole volume. The same difference that there is between the English and the French picture of Aubrey's legendary incident, the same difference is there between the English and the French appreciation of the poetry of Shakspeare. This will become evident as we proceed.

Passing, however, from the minutiae to the more general impressions of the works before us, we have to remark as an additional reason for a want of interest in them proportionate to the claims of their splendid subjects, the absence of any sufficiently vigorous and sustained attempt to portray the characters of the men described. Whatever else the first volume had aimed at, it should surely have aimed at depositing in the mind of the reader a distinct and finished portrait of the man Corneille. We do not speak here of that precise and elaborate account of the peculiarities of his genius which was to be derived from a critical investigation into his writings, but of that more popular delineation of his physiognomy, habits, and circum-

stances as a man and a Parisian of the seventeenth century, which, though it could not have been prepared without the aid of his writings, might have been derived in the main from external records. We do not assert, either, that no description is given of Corneille under this aspect, or that the volume fails in conveying what may pass for a real likeness of its principal subject; we only say that M. Guizot has not *sufficiently* made this a point to be accomplished, and that he has not succeeded in painting Corneille in this volume with the same distinctness, for example, with which, in his *Civilization in France*, he has painted the portrait of Charlemagne. Materials, we should suppose, were not more defective in the one case than in the other; it even seems that it would be far easier to add a distinct and authentic likeness of Corneille to the portrait gallery of eminent Frenchmen, than a similar portrait of Charlemagne. What was wanting was only the conviction that it ought to be done, and resolution and patient art to do it. In the case of Shakspeare the omission, while it is more obvious, is also more excusable. If his own countrymen cannot agree upon the portrait of the poet, if there are as many ways of describing him even in English as there are English biographers of him, it was not to be expected that a foreign biographer would venture on any very specific delineation. Better, perhaps, that he should leave the face and figure of the great unknown as hypothetical as he found them. And yet we think, with all allowance, that M. Guizot might have done a little more in this respect than he has attempted. Who has ever looked at a cast or an engraving of the Stratford bust, with its full and mobile, yet small-featured face, so thoroughly the face of a literary man rather than a man of action; who has ever read Ben Jonson's gossip about Shakspeare and his contemporaries with Drummond of Hawthornden; nay, who has ever critically read Shakspeare's own poems, and especially his minor poems, without forming an image of the poet and his ways which he knows *must* be so far authentic? Besides, it is impossible to write about any man without having *some* image of him and his circumstances, true or false, before the mind's eye; and, true or false, this image will appear in the mere tenor of the narrative, whether it is expressly set forth or not. It is not, therefore, that there is no indication in the present volume of the impression entertained by M. Guizot respecting the character and personal environment of Shakspeare; it is that M. Guizot has taken no pains to make this impression distinct and vivid to himself or his readers,

and that the impression, so far as it is possible to gather it, is poor and unreal.

That our readers may judge for themselves of the truth of these remarks, we shall quote the passages in which the nearest approach is made to a specific delineation of the two men.

Corneille in his relations with Riche'ieu, the courtiers, and the critics of his time.—"At this juncture in his history, when Corneille is about to enter personally into the lists in opposition to such powerful enemies, it is necessary that we should obtain a complete idea of his character and position, in order to be able rightly to judge both of the necessity for making concessions, and of the courage requisite for resistance. Corneille was immediately dependent upon the Cardinal, whom, in a letter to Scudery, he calls 'your master and mine.' This expression shocked Voltaire; but it was not at all at variance with the customs of Corneille's time. At a period when gentlemen of the highest birth entered the service of others more rich than themselves; when money was the natural price paid for all services, and wealth a sort of suzerainty which collected around itself vassals ready to pay it a kind of homage that was considered perfectly legitimate, we need not be surprised that a burgher of Rouen felt no shame in considering himself a domestic, or, if you prefer it, a subject of an all-powerful minister, whose liberality was his mainstay, and in whose favour his hopes were centred. . . . We shall meet with many actions and words, in the life of Corneille, utterly at variance with our ideas and habits. We shall pass with surprise from his tragedies to his dedicatory epistles; and we shall blush to see the same hand—

La main qui crayonna
L'âme du grand Pompée et l'esprit de Cinna,—

stretched forth, if we may be allowed the expression, to solicit liberalities which it did not always obtain. . . . Let us first look at Corneille in his social relations. Destitute of all that distinguishes a man from his equals, he seems to be irrevocably doomed to pass unnoticed in the crowd. His appearance is common, his conversation dull, his language incorrect, his timidity awkward, his judgment uncertain, and his experience perfectly childish. If he finds himself brought into contact, either by necessity or chance, with persons whom birth or fortune has placed above him, he does not rightly appreciate the position which he occupies in respect to them, but thinks only of the one connexion—of protector and protected—which subsists between him and them. Of all their different titles to consideration he regards only the claims which they may possibly have to his gratitude, and thus he will place a Montauron on a level with, if not above, Richelieu and Mazarin. It is always possible to determine by the nature of the homage which Corneille pays, the amount of the reward he received for it. . . . But [M. Guizot here quotes La Bruyère] 'let him elevate himself by composition, and he is not inferior to Augustus, Pom-

pey, Nicomedes, or Heraclius. He is then a king, and a great king; he is a politician—nay more, he is a philosopher.' He has passed into a new sphere; a new horizon has opened before him; he has escaped from the trammels of a position which bound down his imagination to the interests of a fortune far inferior to his faculties; he can now appreciate all the duties necessarily imposed upon generous souls, by an important existence, a lofty destiny, and the possibility and expectation of glory; and with all the force of deep inward conviction, he has laid upon his heroes obligations which he had not been accustomed to attach to the humble social existence of Pierre Corneille. . . .

There is, however, one point on which he is raised by this existence above the vulgar herd—his works issued from the obscurity in which his life was spent. By his literary renown he acquired public importance, and thenceforward he regarded his renown as an object of duty. In his works he pays proper respect to himself; with them was connected not only the honour of his glory, but also the dignity of his character; he would deem himself degraded if he did not acknowledge their merit with all the frankness and boldness of a champion entrusted with their defence, or if he consented to abdicate the rank in which they had placed him. 'It is not your fault,' he says to Scudery, 'that, from that first rank in which I am placed by many competent persons, I have not descended lower even than Claveret.' . . . Nevertheless, even while defending himself so proudly, Corneille did not depart from the ordinary ideas and habits of his conduct, or those which concerned him as a man and not as a poet. He evidently believed in two very distinct kinds of honour, which it appeared to him all the more ridiculous to confound together, as he made no use at all of one of them. The same man who, in the *Cid*, had dilated so loftily upon the duties imposed by honour upon brave men, did not think it necessary to fulfil those duties himself; and, looking at his physical courage as entirely unconcerned in the question, he thus replied to Scudery's rhodomontades: 'There is no necessity for knowing how much nobler or more valiant you may be than myself, in order to judge how far superior the *Cid* is to the *Amant Libéral*. I am not a fighting man; so, in that respect, you have nothing to fear.' So strong was his conviction that the honour of Corneille did not depend upon physical courage."—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 173–181.

Shakspeare in London, and at Stratford.—"Externally, however, his existence seems to have pursued a tranquil course. His name is not mixed up with any literary quarrel; and, but for the malicious allusions of the envious Ben Jonson, hardly a criticism would associate itself with the eulogiums which mark its superiority. All the records of the time exhibit to us Shakspeare placed at last as he had the right to pretend to, sought after for the charm of his character, as much as for the pleasure of his wit, and the admiration due to his genius. A glance cast into the affairs of the poet proves also that he began to carry into the details of his life, that regularity and order which are ne-

cessary for respectability. He is seen purchasing in succession in his native district a house and different pieces of land, of which he formed at last a property sufficient to ensure an easy life. The profits which he derived from the theatre in his capacity as author and actor, have been valued at two hundred pounds sterling a year, a considerable sum for that time; and if the favours of Lord Southampton were added to the economy of the poet, we may infer at least that he did not employ them ill. . . . Like Molière, Shakspeare, if we except his intimacy with Lord Southampton, sought above all his habitual relations among the men of letters, whose social condition he had probably contributed to raise. The *Mermaid Club*, founded by Sir Walter Raleigh, and where Shakspeare, Ben Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, &c., used to meet, was long celebrated for the wit-combats between Ben Jonson and Shakspeare, a frivolous amusement, in which the vivacity of the latter gave him an immense advantage over the laborious slowness of his rival. The examples that are quoted are hardly worth the trouble of collecting. Few *bons mots* can have a career of two centuries. . . . Who would not think that a life thus become honourable and pleasant would long keep Shakspeare in the midst of social circles suitable to the requirements of his wit, and in the theatre of his glory? Yet, in 1613 or 1614 at the latest, three or four years after having obtained from James I. the direction of the Blackfriars Theatre, and though one cannot discern that there was any displeasure towards him either on the part of the king to whom he owed this new favour, or on the part of the public whom he had just presented with *Othello* and the *Tempest*, Shakspeare quitted London and the theatre to go to live at Stratford, in his house of *New Place*, and in the middle of his fields. Did he begin to feel the want of family life? If so, he might have brought his wife and children to London. Nothing indicates that he had been much put about by this separation. During his stay in London he made, it is said, frequent journeys to Stratford; but he is accused of finding even on the road distractions of the same kind as had consoled him at least for the absence of his wife. . . . If the Sonnets of Shakspeare were to be regarded as an expression of his most habitual and cherished feelings, one would be astonished at never finding there a single word relative to his home or his children, even the son he had lost at the age of twelve. Yet Shakspeare cannot have been ignorant of paternal affection; he who in *Macbeth* has painted, &c., could not have looked at his own children without feeling the tenderness of a father's heart. But Shakspeare, as his character presents itself to us, was a man to find, for a long period, in the distractions of society that which could hold, in his thoughts and life, the place he was capable of giving to the affections. However this may be, it is more difficult to fix on the causes which determined his departure from London than to perceive those which may have prolonged his stay there. Perhaps some infirmities had come to warn him of the necessity of repose; perhaps also the very natural desire to show in his native place a style of life so different from that

which he had brought from it, induced him to hasten the moment of renouncing labours which had no longer for their recompense the pleasures of youth. . . . New pleasures could not be wanting to Shakspeare in his retreat. A natural tendency to enjoy all things rendered equally fit for the happiness of a quiet life him whom it had drawn from the vicissitudes of a life of agitation. The first mulberry tree introduced into the neighbourhood of Stratford, and planted by the hands of Shakspeare in a corner of his garden at New Place, attested for more than a century the gentle simplicity of the occupations that filled up his days. An easy competence, the esteem and friendship of his neighbours, all seemed to promise that which crowns so well a brilliant life—a tranquil and honoured old age—when, on the 23d of April 1616, the very day on which he attained his fifty-second year, death removed him from this condition of calm and comfort, whose happy leisure he would perhaps have not always given up to repose alone.—*Shakspeare et son Temps*, pp. 123–127.

From writers of less ability than M. Guizot this might be accepted as very good character-drawing. What is actually said both of Corneille and of Shakspeare, is probably in the right direction; and, with the exception of a certain tinge of the false in the estimate of Shakspeare, arising from one or two minute inaccuracies as to facts and dates which we could point out in the paragraphs quoted, there is perhaps nothing that would require to be positively altered or struck out. But the delineation in both instances is too light, conventional, and irresolute. Both Corneille and Shakspeare, we venture to say, had good decided faces of their own, not in the least like each other, and which, when once seen, impressed themselves so that there could be no difficulty in remembering or recognising them afterwards. Now, though we will not say that, if we had met Corneille coming out of Richelieu's door in Paris, or seen Shakspeare standing by the mulberry tree in the garden at New Place, we should not have had a suspicion, from M. Guizot's descriptions, that the ungainly shopkeeper-looking man with the manuscript in his hand, was Corneille, and the mild elderly gentleman, Shakspeare; we are not sure how much in this case would have depended on our prior knowledge that the door was Richelieu's, and the garden, the garden of New Place, Stratford. Had we met the mild gentleman at Richelieu's door, we might have supposed him to be Corneille; and had we seen the ungainly shopkeeper-looking man going up the gravel-walk at New Place, reading a manuscript, we might have supposed him to be Shakspeare reading one of his plays. And the reason is, that while M. Guizot suggests the ungainly-

ness in the one case, and the mildness in the other, (supposing that these *are* the real characteristics,) he does not do so firmly and impressively, like a painter sure that he is painting from the life. How much more graphic respecting Corneille are the contemporary allusions which M. Guizot's want of art has obliged him to add in foot-notes, instead of involving them in the text—as, for example, the saying of Fontenelle, "M. Corneille was rather large and full of body, and very simple and common in appearance;" or the declarations of Vigneul Marville, "the first time I saw him I took him for a shopkeeper," and "his conversation was so dull that it became burdensome, even if it lasted only a short time;" which last is good-humouredly confirmed by Corneille himself, when he says that "people could rarely hear him without getting tired, unless when he spoke through the mouths of others!" There is the germ, indeed, of a very fine appreciation in the view which M. Guizot gives of Corneille as at one moment the poet nerved even morally up to the pitch of his own glowing intellectual conceptions, making kings and heroes stalk across the stage, and filling their hearts with all kingly resolves and their mouths with all kingly speeches, and then the next moment dropping plump down, amid the circumstances and needs of his own individual life, into an awkward timid creature, respecting every body, and saying what any body that had money wanted him to say, so long, always, as they did not again rouse the lion in him by attacks on his literary reputation. But even this is only suggested, and the reader has to work out the view for himself. As regards Shakspeare, there is even a greater want of decidedness in seizing the indisputable characteristics. If that general mildness and tolerance of spirit is suggested, which all the biographers seem to be agreed upon, there is no qualification of this by the addition of those traits which are infallibly indicated by contemporary allusions which M. Guizot himself must have met with in his researches, as, for example, the trait of excessive fluency in speech, certified by Ben Jonson, or by the incorporation of those deeper hints of intense spiritual significance which are to be derived as authentically from the poet's own writings. M. Guizot makes reference to the Sonnets, but he shews no adequate sense of their biographic value.

A comparison of these "studies" of M. Guizot with the similar writings of Macaulay, or any other of our most celebrated biographic essayists, will illustrate what we have been saying, and will make it manifest that M. Guizot's highest talent does not lie

in character-painting. He excels ordinary writers here as in other things; but this is not his most notable point of superiority. Naturally more at home in the region either of research or of abstract thought, he has not that instinctive facility in dealing with the concrete, that artist's power of divining the characteristic attitudes of the men he describes, and representing them against backgrounds of cunningly-imagined circumstance, which other writers of our day possess; nor has he attempted in the present instances to repair this defect in the only way in which it can be repaired, namely, by laborious investigation, the systematic accumulation of particulars so as to evolve a general idea. This last, to judge from his historical works, few men could have done better.

It may be said, however, that this is too severe a test to apply to publications put forth as mere "literary studies" by a man who has done so much work besides, and one of them, too, put forth at so early a period of his literary life. Setting aside, however, the fact that the earlier of these studies is the better and more finished of the two, we cannot admit that the test in question is too severe to be applied to literary studies, of which such a man as M. Guizot is the author, and such men as Corneille and Shakspeare the subjects. We would apply the same test, if necessary, to any of Macaulay's essays, which are still less pretending in form. But, leaving this matter to be decided according to taste, we shall insist no more upon the merits or demerits of the books, considered with reference to their success as biographies, but shall turn to the examination of them, in what may after all be their more intentional character, as treatises of literary criticism. Here, at all events, it will be admitted, they are to be tried by the highest standard; for in whatever shape a critic puts forth his opinions, whether in a folio or in a pamphlet, the opinions themselves are as long and broad as the chances of their application, and it is with the opinions that we have to do.

There are two styles or methods of literary criticism at present in practice. There is, first, that style or method of criticism which views literary works not so much in themselves as in relation to humanity either in the individual or in the epoch. According to this view of criticism, the business of a critic is to regard a poem or other work of literary art as an illustration, expression, or, if we may so speak, secretion of the whole mental state of the contemporary period. What he has to do, therefore, is to establish generally and make clear in particular cases

this reciprocal relation; to show of any given book, on the one hand, how it is a development of the foreknown genius of the man, or, on the other hand, reversing the process, how the man may be inferred and construed out of it. Literary criticism, so understood, allies itself, it will at once be seen, with biography and history. Books are stripped of that *prestige* which would exempt them from the common lot and the common measure of human things, and authorship is brought down into co-equality and competition with all the thousand other modes of human activity. As battles are the warrior's tribute to civilisation, and signs of the social tendencies at work in the time, so books are the good or bad deeds of the author towards the race, and the symptoms of the social condition out of which they spring. One might fairly ask in this view, though without much hope of an answer, which is deeper in point of significance, or higher in point of merit—a sonnet or a skirmish, a treatise or a victory, a Waterloo or an *In Memoriam*? Now we are great admirers of this theory and this art of literary criticism. We think that it proceeds at once on a nobler view of literature and a more profound philosophy of human nature; and we believe that the finest feats of modern criticism are to be traced to its growing prevalence. True, it brings us into contact with great difficulties. In the case of a Dante, a Byron, a Burns, or any others of the so-called “subjective” poets, who write out almost professedly their own feelings and experience, the method spontaneously forces itself into view; and hence in these cases criticism *has* always gone hand in hand with Biography and History. But how apply the method to the so-called “objective” class of writers, whose productions are, to all appearance, not revelations of self, but merely shapes and phantasies in ideal matter? How, for example, deduce a *Cid* or a *Cinna* from the personal existence of a Corneille; or how refer the noble sentiments of those heroes who dared all for honour, to their spring in the soul of a man who would have made any apology in the world for any act of his life rather than face a pistol? Or, to take a still more curious example, which would fall strictly under the same head, how identify the grandeur of the *Novum Organum* with the life of Lord Chancellor Bacon? Was he, as the poet says, the meanest of mankind, and, if so, *could* he be the wisest, and *can* his *Organum* be a great book? These are problems which we have as yet no calculus to solve, and yet which necessarily arise out of that view of criticism which we have been describing. Meanwhile, there-

fore, we must still fall back, in a great measure, upon that other kind of criticism which is consecrated by the practice of all ages, and which consists in viewing the productions of literature, not in their relation either to the personal history of their authors, or to the peculiarities of the social progress at the time when they were written, but simply as exercises in a special art, which has or may have its own principles and rules. It was Wordsworth, we think, who maintained that this should be the only kind of criticism, and that it was not proper, in investigating the works of a poet, to make any reference to the man. Except as a precaution against the mere impertinence of contemporary gossip, or against shallow judgments respecting the lives of literary men of previous times, we have no respect for this maxim, and even think it likely to do harm. Still, precisely as there may be a criticism of battles, apart altogether from considerations of their social meaning, as mere exercises in an art whose principles are fixed or may be fixed, so there may be a criticism of books apart from all consideration of their biographical or historical significance. A tragedy may be viewed as a tragedy; it may be gone over in detail, and its beauties or its blemishes detected and explained; the plot, characters, language, division into scenes, &c., may be all tried according to certain principles which regulate, or are supposed to regulate, this species of composition; if there are deviations from these principles and still the effect is fine, the reasons for this may be assigned, and the assumed principles shewn accordingly to be so far modifiable; the tragedy may be compared with previous works of the same kind, and its special merits or defects, as a whole, may be thus more clearly brought out—and all this may be done without any retrospective allusion to the character and circumstances of the author, notwithstanding that it is well understood all the while that the tragedy could not have been what it is, had not the author been precisely such and such a man, situated precisely in such and such circumstances. Only Shakspeare could have written *King Lear*; and yet, once written and published, *King Lear* is an existence by itself which may walk loose about the world, and be studied by men as one of many similar things belonging to a common denomination, without ever referring to its parentage. The best collection of principles in this kind of criticism, particularly as regards the Drama, is perhaps that contained in the *Poetics* of Aristotle. A masterly analysis of the laws of dramatic effect, so far as these accorded with the Greek mind, or had been exhibited

in Greek examples, this treatise has come down to us with all the weight that antique authority can give it as a permanent rule in literature.

In the works before us we have a mixture of both kinds of criticism. The writings of the great French and those of the great English dramatist are studied in connexion with their lives and with the social peculiarities and tendencies of their times; and yet there are independent criticisms of these writings as separate and individual exercises in the dramatic art. As might have been expected from a writer so full of the historic spirit as M. Guizot, the volume abounds, in particular, in lucid and ingenious remarks on the intimate affinities between history and literature. Perhaps the finest specimen of the author's powers in this respect is that furnished by the newly written preface to the "Corneille," which consists of a critical appreciation of the influence exercised over the spirit of recent French literature by the three great literary powers that represented the French intellect during the Empire of Napoleon—the *Journal des Débats*, Chateaubriand, and Madame de Stael. We must content ourselves, however, with quoting from the body of the volume one remark on a more general topic. It is evidently a remark to which M. Guizot attaches great value, for he has repeated it in the "Shakspeare." It comes very suitably after what we have been saying:—

Complexity of the Causes which determine the Character of Modern Literature.—"Conjectures founded upon the natural progress of the human mind fail when we have to account for the course pursued by the literature of modern times. Among a people whose character is formed in a simple manner, and whose civilisation is the result of the free and harmonious development of the human mind, the question of the origin of literature, although somewhat complicated in itself, is not very difficult of solution: the answer must be sought for and will be found in the spontaneous expansion of our nature. Poetry, the first outburst of a budding imagination in the midst of a world that is new to it, then finds in all surrounding objects themes for its songs, and derives from the simplest sights a host of sensations previously unknown. . . . The Greeks took delight in song; and Homer sang,—he sang the victories of his fellow-countrymen, their quarrels and reconciliations, their games and festivals, their business and their pleasures. On the shield of Achilles are displayed flocks, harvests, and vintages; conjugal affection gives tenderness to the farewells of Andromache; Priam is a father weeping over the loss of his son; and Achilles utters the laments of friendship over the body of Patroclus. Thus the most natural feelings and the simplest interests were what inspired the muse of the prince of poets. . . . If Homer had disappeared, and it were possible to

invent him, it would be said: Such a man he must have been—an exemplification of that which could not fail to be produced by the development of the happiest faculties among a people at liberty to display them all, and among whom nothing had occurred to distort their character, to disturb their harmony, or to divert their course. . . . Such could not be the case with regard to modern nations. When they established themselves on the ruins of a world that had already grown old, they were ignorant and incapable of comprehending those institutions from which their coarse manners were about to receive some forms equally rude and more incoherent. A divine religion, coming down into the midst of nations at once enlightened and corrupted by a long term of existence; a sublime morality, based on the precepts of the Gospel, too perfect for the manners of those who are about to receive it, and yet sufficiently positive to exact their obedience; towns and palaces, which had been conquered, and were inhabited by savages incompetent to appreciate the skill which had erected them; luxury for which they had acquired a taste, and to which they became habituated, before they had learned its use; enjoyments, distinctions, and titles which had been invented by the vanity of an effeminate world, and which were paraded by barbarian vanity rather in imitation than from necessity—all these facts could not fail to strike these new peoples as being one of those strange and confused spectacles at which ignorant spectators cannot even manifest sufficient astonishment, because they do not perceive its hidden springs and secret workings; all these causes necessarily led to that confusedness of ideas, to those fantastic and incomplete associations of thought, of which modern litterateurs, in their early essays, and even in their masterpieces, present traces which, though varying in distinctness, are everywhere visible. . . . It is this complication of causes in the manners of the Middle Ages, this singular mixture of natural barbarism and acquired civilisation, of antiquated notions and modern ideas, which renders it very difficult to explain the course pursued by the various literatures that issued from these times."—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 2-8.

This remark, the full force of which will at once reveal itself to the intelligent reader, forms a very fit introduction to volumes which have it for their purpose to appreciate the genius and influence of two men so pre-eminently instrumental in determining and stimulating, the one for France and the other for England, the vast literary movement of modern times, the offspring of that Germanic chaos. Corneille is the admitted father of French tragedy, and one of the earliest of the really classic authors in any department of French literature. His influence on the subsequent form and direction of that literature has been very great as to degree, and very marked as to kind. Had he not lived it is very probable that French literature would have now presented a somewhat different assemblage of characteristic

qualities. Corneille's is therefore a really national literary name, deservedly ranked by Frenchmen along with those of Rabelais, Molière, Racine, Lafontaine, Bossuet, Rousseau, and Voltaire, all of whom have impressed in succession the stamp of their own intellectual features on the mind of the French people. A similar place, as regards English literature, belongs to Shakspeare. True, in having produced a Chaucer, England has a right to go farther back than France can for the source and commencement of her strictly great literature. True, also, Shakspeare, by the vast dimension and the towering height of his genius, transcends the order of mere national poets. If he is to be defined as related by special affinities to any particular portion of the human race at all, he ought to be defined rather as the poet of the Teutonic nations as a whole, than as the poet exclusively of England. Even within England his position as a national poet differs wholly from that of Corneille in France. What Homer was to the Greeks, and what Dante is to the Italians—this, rather than what Corneille is to the French, is Shakspeare to Englishmen. He is the one of all, rather than one among many. Yet Shakspeare has his more special historical relations too; and, if in the order of power and duration of influence he stands apart, yet, in the order of successive action, he forms one of a list including such other names as Chaucer, Spenser, Milton, Pope, Wordsworth, and Byron. If it fell to Corneille in France to do much towards converting the general literary movement of modern times, so far as it affected France, into that which we now recognise as the French form of literature, it fell to Shakspeare in a still higher degree to perform the same service for the mind of England. They were both, if not the founders of, at least great dynastic powers in, their respective literatures.

A word or two first on the genius of Corneille. M. Guizot has accomplished this part of his task in many respects beautifully. He first prepares the field for the advent of Corneille, by showing how the French taste in poetry, and the resources of French verse, as originally exhibited in the *Roman de Rose* and other obsolete productions of the chivalry period, had been modified and tested by a series of minor court-poets, the principal of whom were Marot, Ronsard, and Malherbe. He shows how the drama, popular in its origin in France, as in all other countries, had become, towards the close of the sixteenth century, the most hopeful and characteristic portion of an infant literature. He indicates how much

had been done or was being done in this department, and more especially for French comedy, by such writers as Jodelle, Garnier, Mariet, Rotrou, and Hardy. Into this field he introduces Corneille. Born at Rouen in 1606, and brought up for the profession of the bar, the future tragic poet made his first dramatic essays in comedy. He had written various pieces of this kind, which were acted in Paris with more or less of success, and which struck the critics of the day by a certain strength of sense, and logical firmness of style, then unknown to the stage, when accident, and reflection on his own powers, turned his attention to tragedy. His first attempt in this style was the *Médée*, a kind of paraphrase from Seneca, in some portions of which, according to Voltaire, Corneille clearly flashed forth in all his superiority, and which at last drew from the contemporary English poet Waller this high compliment, that "though the others made plenty of verses, Corneille alone could think." But Corneille's first master-piece was the *Cid*, published in 1636. This piece established his reputation as the first poet of the day in France. There was, indeed, a storm of criticism in private circles: and Richelieu, who at that time was unfriendly to Corneille, did his best to have him crushed by the adverse opinion of the academy; but the popular voice was unanimous, and the poet's position remained unshaken. The *Cid* was rapidly followed up by other pieces, some of which were even superior, and almost all of which were triumphs,—*Les Horaces*, *Cinna*, *Polyeucte*, *Pompée*, *Le Menteur*, *Rodogune*, *Heraclius*, *Théodore*, *Andromède*, *Don Sanche d'Arragon*, *Nicomède*, and *Pertharite*. The last, indeed, was a failure, from which the poet did not recover himself in any of his subsequent attempts; and, before his death in 1684, he saw his fame eclipsed by the younger glories of Racine and Molière. Posterity, however, seeing the three poets at an equal distance, is able now to do justice in turn to the peculiar merits of each. Let us hear how M. Guizot characterizes the genius and "mission" of Corneille.

"If Corneille accomplished the revolution which regenerated our drama, or rather, if he exercised that creative action which liberated our drama from its primitive chaos, it was because he introduced into his writings *truth*, which was then banished from all poetical compositions. That energy, that imposing majesty, those sublime soarings of genius, all those qualities which gained Corneille the title of 'the great,' are personal merits which have immortalized the name of the poet, without preserving, after him, any dominant influence over dramatic art. Tragedy might be beautiful otherwise than as Corneille

conceived it, and Corneille has remained great without preventing other great men from taking a place beside him. But tragedy could gain life only by repaireing to that fountain of truth which Corneille was the first to discover. Before his appearance, every day seemed to remove the public and the poets farther from it; and every day buried the treasures of the human heart more deeply beneath the fantastic inventions of false wit and a disordered imagination. Corneille was the first to reveal these treasures to dramatic art, and to teach it how to use them. On this ground he is rightfully regarded as the father, and the *Cid* as the origin, of French tragedy. . . . It is impossible to imagine what Corneille's genius would have become, and to define either the extraordinary beauties which it might have unfolded, or the flights of which it might have been guilty, if he had boldly abandoned himself to his own guidance. As regarded his own personal knowledge, Corneille was in almost the same position as Shakspeare and Calderon; but his age and country were more civilized than theirs, and criticism availed itself, for the instruction of the poet, of all the acquirements of his age and country. Corneille feared and braved criticism, and provoked it by his defiance; he would allow none of its censures, but he did all he could to avoid them. Taking warning by a first attack, he no longer ventured to hazard, for fear of Scudery, all that France would probably have applauded. Incapable of yielding to his adversaries, and angry at being obliged to combat them, he withdrew from the path on which he was likely to meet them; and though this perhaps involuntary prudence saved him from some dangerous quicksands, it undoubtedly deprived him of some precious discoveries. The success of the *Cid* did not efface, in his mind, the censure of the Academy. In that drama he had allowed himself to depict, with irresistible truth, the transports of passion; but when he found Chimène's love so severely condemned, Corneille, doubtless alarmed at what he might find in the weakness of the heart, looked in future only to its strength; he sought for the resisting element in man, and not for the yielding, and thus became acquainted with only the half of man. And as admiration is the feeling chiefly excited by heroic resistance, it was to *admiration* that the dramatic genius of Corneille principally addressed itself. . . . [Here follows a disquisition in which M. Guizot contends, against the opinion of Boileau and Voltaire, that admiration does hold a legitimate place among the tragic passions, and is as suitable for dramatic effect as pity, terror, and the like. He believes, however, that Corneille has overdone it, and is too monotonously sublime.] . . . More conflicts of passion, and a little more weakness, would have rendered Corneille's heroes more constantly true and dramatic; even their virtue, which may often be regarded as the principal personage of the piece, would have interested us more, if, though equally able to conquer, it had been attacked by more potent foes, and had visibly incurred greater dangers. All the vigour of his noble genius was requisite to discover a sufficient source of interest in those singular characters which he alone could create and sustain; he alone has succeeded in awakening

our uncertainty and curiosity by their very inflexibility, which, as it is announced at the outset, does not permit them to yield to the slightest weakness, and multiplies successively around them embarrassments which ceaselessly necessitate greater and more extraordinary efforts. . . .

. . . In order to attain to this invincible power, which will make all around it bend to its influence, a man must absolutely have separated himself from all that otherwise enters into the composition of human nature; he must have completely ceased to think of all that, in real life, occurs to alter the forms of that ideal grandeur of which the imagination can conceive no possibility except when, isolating it, so to speak, from all other affections, it forgets that which renders its realization so difficult and so infrequent. The imagination of Corneille had no difficulty in lending itself to this isolation; the loftiness of his inventions was sustained by his inexperience in the common affairs of life; as he introduced into his own ordinary actions none of those ideas which he employed in the creation of his heroes, so in the conception of his heroes he employed none of the ideas of which he made use in ordinary life. He did not place Corneille himself in their position: the observation of nature did not occupy his attention; a happy inspiration frequently led him to divine it; but his unassisted imagination, gathering together outlines of a far more simple character, composed for him a sort of abstract model of a single quality, a being without parts, if I may be allowed the expression, capable of being set in motion by a single impulse, and of proceeding in a single direction. . . . To the same cause also must be attributed the variableness of Corneille's maxims, though they are always expressed with the most absolute confidence: and in this way we must explain how it is that his morality is sometimes so severe and sometimes so lax—that he sometimes enunciates principles of the sternest republicanism, and sometimes of the most servile obedience. The fact is, that whether Corneille be contemplating the republican or the subject of a king—the hero or the politician—he abandons himself without reserve to the system, the position, or the character which he is describing, and carefully avoids all reference to general ideas that might come into conflict with the particular ideas which he is desirous of bringing upon the stage, and which vary according to the personages of the drama. This unreserved adoption of a special principle, changing with the circumstances of the piece, gained Corneille credit for great skill in representing the local colour and genius of different peoples and states; whilst this merit was denied to Racine, whose descriptions, being of a more general nature, seem too familiar to our eyes to belong, by any possibility, to other times than our own. Racine's heroes were recognised at once, and claimed as Frenchmen; but the singular physiognomy of Corneille's heroes enabled them to pass easily for Greeks or Romans. . . . The *style* of Corneille varied with the vicissitudes of his genius. Astonishment has been expressed at this; but there would have been more room for astonishment had it been otherwise, and had his style not remained faithful, both in good and evil fortune, to the character of his thoughts.

Writing was never anything to him but the expression of his ideas ; and his contemporaries attest that carefulness of style was of no avail in effects which were entirely due to the grandeur of the subjects which he had to depict. 'Corneille,' says Segrais, 'was not conscious of the beauty of his versification, and while writing he paid attention not to harmony but only to feeling.' And Chapelain informs us, that 'Corneille, who has written such noble poetry, was unacquainted with the art of versification, and it was purely nature that acted in him.' An artistic style, which, at the time when Corneille appeared, constituted almost the whole merit of a fashionable poet, had very little indeed to do with the merit of a dramatic author. Corneille introduced style into the drama by introducing thoughts ; he said simply what he meant, and he therefore spoke nobly, for what he had to say was high and noble. We must not, therefore, expect to find in Corneille that poetical expression which is intended to increase the impression produced by an object, by connecting with it accessory ideas which the object would not have suggested of itself. All necessary circumstances, and these alone, he brings before our eyes, because he has seen them ; he could not fail to see them in the position in which he was placed, and into that position he transfers us. This is true poetry."—*Corneille and his Times*, pp. 203–259.

This is truly superior criticism. It shows what masterly things may be said by a man of real thought in connexion with the most hackneyed subject. If anything is still wanted to complete the delineation of Corneille up to that degree of distinctness and individuality which might be necessary for the sake of the English reader, who may not know the poet from his own writings, it is partly because this additional something must have seemed too familiar to a French critic to be worth expressing, and partly because it could only present itself with much force to one standing clear of the associations of French poetry altogether, and disposed, therefore, not only to take note of the peculiarities of Corneille among French poets, but also to involve in his criticisms the peculiarities of French poetry itself.

Were we to define in one word the genius of Corneille, in the aspect in which it is likely to impress an English critic, we should say that it is the genius of poetic declamation. We mean no disparagement by this epithet ; we mean very high praise. Every man has his forte. Every man has some attitude, set, position, or prescribed aim and purpose of his faculties, in accordance with which they work best. The faculties may exist in all varieties of proportions, and may show themselves in all manner of independent ways ; but the man deals his best stroke, and shoots his clearest lightnings, when the faculties assume the prescribed attitude, and are provided with the appro-

priate set of external circumstances. Samuel Johnson was best in conversation, with Burke and Reynolds listening, and Bozzy leaning behind his chair to receive the spare knocks ; Joachim Murat was best at the head of a charge of horse, when the scabbards jingled as the men dashed on, and the sun gleamed on a sea of sabres. And so also with the poet ; except that in his case life does not furnish the actual, but the mind itself provides an ideal, set of circumstances. The poet Moore, for example, did his best when he wrote for those situations of life in which a light gaiety or a sentimental melancholy is sought after as a social luxury ; his songs were written to be sung in well-lighted modern rooms, as one of the artificial accompaniments of a festive occasion. Horace was most sagacious when he saw himself in the company of Mæcenas and a few other such cronies of the right Epicurean sort, strolling over the fallen leaves in the walks about a country villa, or reclining *al fresco* over filberts and Falernian. In the heart of Homer, we should suppose, the poetic glow was at its height, when he rehearsed in low and solitary recitative the strain he was to conduct as chief of the bards at some royal hall close to the murmurs of the Ægean. And so on with other poets, although it may not always be so easy to describe the characteristic group of ideal associations. Now Corneille, as it appears to us, wrote best when he fancied those situations the proper outcome of which was a measured flow of fine declamation. This, let it be observed, does not necessarily limit within any very narrow range the field of his poetic observation. Precisely as Moore, though his songs were to be sung in a London drawing-room, could bring their subjects from the East or from the wilds of Ireland ; or as Horace, with all his *penchant* for the villa and the Falernian, could go out a good way and ascend to a good height for the topics he was to bring back for the edification of himself and his guests—so in Corneille, breadth and discursiveness of imagination might very well be consistent with his special excellence in the attitude of a declaimer. The only necessary limit was that what he did imagine should be imagined in that way in which a fine declamatory effect should easily arise. And certainly there are few instances in which a poet has, with so much of real poetic vigour and variety, produced such noble passages to be uttered by a stately actor before an audience. Corneille, awkward bourgeois as he was in private life, stalks the stage in his poetry, with the majesty of a Talma ; there is kingly magnificence in his look and step, and every thought

and word is to correspond. His plays are full of noble speeches. As he fancied his hero or situation, he did this, as M. Guizot well says, with the most perfect distinctness of vision; the man and the juncture of circumstances stood before him insulated from all that was irrelevant or unnecessary; the feeling appropriate to the imagined moment rushed up in his soul, clear, single, and strong; and, when he gave vent to this feeling, it was in words so terse, so direct, and delivered with such weight, and even epigram, right on the intelligence, amid all their riot of passion, that Demosthenes himself could not have spoken better. M. Guizot well describes the peculiarity of Corneille's style as that of "energetic concision." We could quote example after example through many pages, but let a few suffice. What poet has furnished lines which a good actor could deliver with more electric effect, or of which an orator could more finely avail himself in his moments of highest inspiration, than such lines as these:—

"Un moment donne au sort des visages divers;
Et, dans ce grand bonheur, je crains un grand revers."

"A qui venge son père il n'est rien impossible
Ton bras est invaincu, mais non pas invincible."

"Les hommes valeureux le sont du premier coup."

"Vouez parlez en soldat; je dois agir en roi."

"Un grand destin commence, un grand destin s'achève."

"Non, je ne pleure point, Madame, mais je meurs."

"Un véritable amant ne connaît point d'amis."

"Qui n'appréhende rien présume trop de soi."

"Il est beau de mourir maître de l'univers;
Mais la plus belle mort souille notre mémoire,
Quand nous avons vu vivre et croître notre gloire."

Prusias. "Je veux mettre d'accord l'amour et la nature,
Être père et mari dans cette conjuncture."

Nicomède. Seigneur, voulez-vous bien vous fier à moi,
Ne soyez l'un ni l'autre.

Prusias. Et que dois-je être ?

Nicomède. Reprenez hautement ce noble caractère;
Un véritable roi n'est ni mari ni père,
Il regarde son trône et rien de plus. Réglez !"

If the reader wants longer specimens, let him turn over the plays for himself, not forgetting to look again at such well-known passages as the famous imprecation of Camille on Rome in the *Horaces*, and the grand soliloquy of Augustus, when he discovers the conspiracy against him in *Cinna*. There are no passages of poetical declamation in any language superior to those; and they are but two out of hundreds.

Were we desirous to follow out this passing remark as to the special respect in which Corneille impresses an Englishman, into a farther appreciation involving the degree to which truth and greatness in poetry can be attained under such a condition of genius as that just indicated, and involving also the

question of the inherent poetical capacities of a people which has furnished such a poet as its highest or nearly so, we should be able to do so best by going through all that Guizot says respecting Shakspeare, and then shewing that what he says respecting him is determined very much by those associations with the word *Poetry*, which naturally cling to a critic who is a countryman of Corneille. We have room, however, but for a very slight notice of Guizot's estimate of Shakspeare; and, therefore, any reflex bearing which our remarks on that estimate may have on French Poetry in general, or on Corneille in particular, must be left for inference.

On the whole, England has no reason to complain of the manner in which M. Guizot has spoken of her intellectual idol. He has praised Shakspeare to the skies. The intellect, the imagination, the fancy, the wit, the humour of the English poet are all lauded again and again, in language confessing its own weakness in regard to so superb an object for critical description. The epithets great, prodigious, immense, and the like, are heaped upon the dead, till, by their very plenty, they become rubbish. And if, doing all this in honour of the Teutonic poet, M. Guizot, as a Frenchman, should just stop short of the admission that he is to be regarded as the most magnificent thing, in the way of intellect, that the world has ever seen, can we wonder at it? Even if he believed it, it would be too much to expect that he should have deliberately expressed the belief; unless, indeed, he could have appended to the volume an historical dissertation to prove that the Shakspeares of Warwickshire came originally from the neighbourhood of Paris.

But, while thus vying with Englishmen in doing justice to the magnificence of dimension and the exquisite quality of Shakspeare's genius, M. Guizot does take leave to part with us at certain points in this race of laudation, and to administer, as correctives of our idolatrous worship, certain distinct and unhesitating criticisms on the contour of the idol, and on our taste in admiring him. In other words, M. Guizot points out certain serious faults in Shakspeare as an artist. The faults are various, and they are described many times; but they seem to be summed up pretty completely in the following passage:

Substance and Form.—"It is in the substance that Shakspeare excels, it is in the form that he fails. (*C'est par le fond que Shakspeare excelle, et par la forme qu'il pèche.*) He discerns and brings admirably into view the instincts, the passions, ideas—indeed all the inner life of man;

he is the most profound and dramatic of moralists; but he makes his personages speak a language which is often fastidious, strange, excessive, and destitute of moderation and naturalness—(*recherché, étrange, excessif, dépourvu de mesure et de naturel.*) And the English language is singularly propitious to the defects, as well as to the beauties of Shakspeare. It is rich, energetic, passionate, abundant, striking; it readily admits the lofty flights and even the wild excesses of the poetic imagination; but it does not possess that elegant sobriety, that severe and delicate precision, that moderation in expression, and harmony in imagery, which constitute the peculiar merit of the French language; so that when Shakspeare passes from England into France, if he is translated with scrupulous fidelity, his defects become more apparent, and more offensive, beneath his new dress, than they were in his native form; and if, on the other hand, it is attempted to adapt his language, even in the slightest degree, to the genius of our tongue, he is inevitably robbed of a great part of his wealth, force, and originality.”—*Shakspeare and his Times, Preface*, pp. iv. v.

Confusion of Tragedy and Comedy.—“The Greeks, whose mind and civilisation followed so regular a course in their development, did not combine the two kinds of composition, and the distinction which separates them in nature was maintained without effort in art. Tragedy and Comedy shared man and the world between them, each taking a different domain in the region of realities, and coming by turns to offer to the serious or mirthful consideration of a people who invariably insisted on simplicity and harmony, the poetic effects which their skill could derive from the materials placed in their hands. . . . In our modern world all things have borne another character. Order, regularity, natural and easy development seem to have been banished from it. Immense interests, admirable ideas, sublime sentiments have been thrown, as it were, pell-mell with brutal passions, coarse necessities, and vulgar habits. The incoherent assemblage of all that human nature and destiny contain of that which is great and little, noble and trivial, serious and puerile, strong and wretched—this is what man and society have been in our Europe. In such a state of mind and things, how was it possible for a clear distinction and simple classification of styles and arts to be effected? How could Tragedy and Comedy have presented and formed themselves isolatedly in literature, when, in reality, they were incessantly in contact, entwined in the same facts, and intermingled in the same actions so thoroughly that it was sometimes difficult to discern the moment of passage from one to the other? Was it proposed to bring upon the stage the habitual occurrences of ordinary life? Taste was as easily satisfied as manners. Those religious performances which were the origin of the European theatre, had not escaped this admixture. The first Mysteries brought simultaneously upon the stage the emotions of religious terror and tenderness and the buffooneries of vulgar comicality: and thus in the very

cradle of dramatic poetry, tragedy and comedy contracted that alliance which was inevitably forced upon them by the general condition of nations and minds. . . . In France, however, this alliance was speedily broken off. We may affirm that in France comedy, in an imperfect, but distinct form, was created before tragedy. At a later period, the rigorous separation of classes, the absence of popular institutions, the regular action of the supreme power, &c., disposed the popular mind to maintain that strict distinction between the two styles which was ordained by the classical authorities who held undisputed sway over our drama. . . . Nothing of this kind took place among the English. The asylum of German manners as well as of German liberties, England pursued without obstacle the irregular but natural course of the civilisation which such elements could not fail to engender. It retained their disorder as well as their energy; and until the middle of the seventeenth century, its literature, as well as its institutions, was the sincere expression of these qualities. When the English drama attempted to reproduce the poetic image of the world, tragedy and comedy were not separated.

. . . . It is utterly futile to attempt to base any classification of Shakspeare's works on the distinction between the comic and the tragic elements; they cannot possibly be divided into these two styles, but must be separated into the fantastic and the real, the romance and the world. The first class contains most of his comedies; the second comprehends all his tragedies—immense and living stages upon which all things are represented, as it were, in their solid form, and in the place which they occupied in a stormy and complicated state of civilisation. . . . [M. Guizot then goes on to illustrate this theory of the dramatic art, and to plead for its toleration by the votaries of the stricter classic, on account of the splendid effects with which genius has consecrated it; he appears decidedly to think, however, that, in the blending of the tragic and the comic so broadly in the same play, Shakspeare has often committed offences against reason and taste under any theory, and hence he adopts as his own what follows, which is from the Essay attributed to the Duc de Broglie.] . . . The mixture of comedy and tragedy is not, or certainly ought not to be a purely arbitrary thing. Never should the contrast be allowed, unless under the condition, that the dominant impression, which is chiefly to be regarded, should be developed and not destroyed, should not be lost sight of, but rendered more lasting and profound. No one knew this better than Shakspeare, no one has illustrated it by more numerous and beautiful examples. But we confess we cannot find them in *Othello*. In this play the comic element is purely arbitrary; it is, in some sort appended to the tragic, while there is no intimate relation between the one and the other, no common aim, no alliance to be ratified by the deep experiences of the soul. Let Roderigo be eliminated from the piece—a genuine melodramatic simpleton, who only appears that he may serve as a butt to Iago, to be beduded and befooled by him: you can do

so; what Roderigo does might be done quite as well by any one else; no one, Iago excepted, would know or care for his absence. Let Brabantio, the firm and prudent senator, full of ability and self-possession, dignified and respected, be true to his proper character; let him not be transformed, during two whole scenes, merely to suit the whim of the author, into a Geronte or a Sganarelle. Let Cassio fall into disgrace with his general from some more worthy motive than that supplied by taking a glass of wine at an unseasonable time. Lastly, erase entirely the part of the clown, a part so false that the French imitator, though he has in general adhered most conscientiously to the original, did not think himself bound to preserve it."—*Shakspeare and his Times*, pp. 78–98; and pp. 316–318.

Shakspeare's chief fault.—"One misfortune happened to Shakspeare: though he was always lavish of his wealth, he was not always able to distribute it either opportunely or skilfully. This was frequently the misfortune of Corneille also. Ideas accumulated about Corneille, as about Shakspeare, confusedly and tumultuously, and neither of them had the courage to treat his own mind with prudent severity. They forgot the position of the character they were describing, in order to indulge in the thoughts which it awakened in the soul of the poet. In Shakspeare especially, this excessive indulgence in his own ideas and feelings sometimes arrests and interrupts the emotions awakened in the breast of the spectator, in a manner which is fatal to dramatic effect. It is not merely, as in Corneille, the ingenious loquacity of a rather talkative mind, but it is the restless and fantastic reverie (*l'inquiète et bizarre rêverie*) of a mind astonished at its own discoveries, not knowing how to reproduce the whole impression which it has received from them, and heaping ideas, images, and expressions, one upon another, in order to awaken in us feelings similar to those by which it is itself oppressed.

Hence arose the true and great fault of Shakspeare, the only one that originated in himself, and which is sometimes perceptible even in his finest conceptions; and that is, a deceptive appearance of laborious research, (*recherche pleine d'effort*.) which is occasioned, on the contrary, by the absence of labour. Accustomed, by the taste of his age, frequently to connect ideas and expressions by their most distant relations, he contracted the habit of that learned subtlety which perceives and assimilates everything, and leaves no point of resemblance unnoticed; and this fault has more than once marred the gaiety of his comedies, as well as destroyed the pathos of his tragedies. If meditation had taught Shakspeare to fall back upon himself, to contemplate his own strength, and to concentrate it by skilful management, he would soon have rejected the abuse which he has made of it, and would have speedily become conscious that neither his heroes nor his spectators could follow him in that prodigious movement of ideas, feelings, and intentions which, on every occasion and under the slightest pretext, arose and obtruded them-

selves upon his own thought."—*Shakspeare and his Times*, pp. 113–116.

Now, as Thomas Aquinas has ingeniously remarked, all men are fallible. Shakspeare, we dare say, had his faults like other men, and could have written sometimes better if he had tried harder, had a French education, studied Boileau, or been quite free from headache. We are not going to defend all his *torturato* passages, every witticism of his clowns, or his errors in geography and chronology. He may, as some of his advocates hold, have had deep meanings even in his errata, though we cannot make that the subject of affidavit. But "great barbarian," "Attila-Shakspeare,"—this notion of our bard, whether in the old and unmodified shape in which Voltaire disseminated it, or in the new and more elevated, and altogether more mild and reverential sense in which the foregoing passages suggest it, we will not for a moment endure. And, in fact, to confess the truth, we would rather not have Shakspeare spoken against at all. As the old parishioner of Ettrick said to the Unitarian lecturer, who, after attacking the theology of his former pastor, began to attack his character,—"*Haud aff Tammas Boston, Sir; haud aff Tammas Boston.*"

After all, it is a question of races. This attempt to indicate the evidences of a supposed tinge of barbarism in the genius of Shakspeare; these assertions that the prodigious strength and abundance of mind shewn in his works, as regards substance, are accompanied by rudeness and defect as regards form; these objections to his mode of mingling the tragic and the comic, and proposals to improve his plays by omitting the Roderigos, making the Brabantios more stately, and sweeping out all the clowns; these complaints against him for an intellectual incontinence which is constantly giving people more than they want, and pouring out volumes of thought, analogy, and occult allusion, if but a pane of glass breaks;—all this, we say, is nothing more than the inevitable display of what a Frenchman, as such, feels, when he contemplates the highest example of Teutonic art. No man can jump off his own shadow; and M. Guizot, as a Frenchman, is not related so truly as we are to the Pan-Teutonic poet. Yes, that is the name for Shakspeare! Germans, Danes, and Swedes, as well as Englishmen, accept him precisely as he is, admitting only those defects, incapable of being classed, which attach to all human performances. It is the Frenchman alone, or the man of French training, that can receive from Shakspeare that impression of dissatisfaction or

offended taste which arises from the sight of deviations from a supposed principle. Let any one who desires to see this verified and illustrated compare Guizot's criticisms on Shakspeare with those of the German Ulrici. In Ulrici, besides general criticism of a different, and, we think, far deeper order, the reader will find exactly that kind of philosophical justification of Shakspeare's supposed faults, and especially of his confusion of the comic and the tragic, which, according to the view we now present, a German could best give. There he will find the eternal theory of Clowns, and the reason why there should be a clown present even when murder is in the wind, and a kingdom is about to crack; there he will find Roderigo's charter of existence fully made out, and a profound explanation given why, on *a priori* grounds, Cassio got drunk. Placing himself in each play at what he conceives to be the central point, the critic accepts all that issued from the poet's mind in its moment of creative energy, as belonging necessarily to that moment, and necessarily coherent throughout; and then makes it his business to do what the poet perhaps could not have done for himself, consciously dissect the separate parts, and shew their scientific relation to the whole. And thus everything in Shakspeare is reduced back to its source in the real feelings of a Teutonic mind in the act of contemplating nature.

We back the heavy Ulrici against the lighter and more lucid Guizot. We will indicate, in conclusion, our reason for doing so. It is a reason, we think, which will elevate the Teutonic adhesion to Shakspeare over the Gallic criticism of him, by shewing that, though the former as well as the latter may connect itself with prejudice of race, it can yet, if need be, exhibit a higher sanction in fact and science. If what we shall say should seem to revive the memory of the old and tiresome controversy between Classicism and Romanticism, we cannot help that.

Europe, then, seems to us to have had, in the widest sense, only two Literatures; which are, in fact, also, (if we omit one Eastern Literature of immense and peculiar significance,) the only great Literatures that have been in the world. These are—the Southern or Græco-Latin Literature, of which we here account the modern Italian, the French, and the Spanish as separate, though not wholly pure, continuations; and the Northern or Teutonic Literature, of which the English, the German, and the Scandinavian Literatures are branches. There is a difference of spirit between these

two Literatures, and this difference of spirit is best seen by a comparison of the masterpieces of poetic creation that have illustrated each. First came the Greek, casting *his* poetic eye over the appearances of life and nature. In him the imagination, that faculty or that use of the faculties which in all languages is set apart as most properly the requisite of the poet, existed in the highest conceivable degree; but if we inquire more particularly as to the manner or style in which this imagination of the Greek worked, we shall find that it delighted above all in setting forth images of concrete things in clear shape and outline, with the least possible efflux, while doing so, of the matter secreted in the mind itself during the intellectual act. The grandest examples of this are the poems of Homer, Æschylus, and Sophocles; the comparative dissatisfaction of the critics with the third tragic poet, Euripides, arising in a great degree from the fact that he was not so purely a Greek in this respect. From the Greeks the literary sovereignty passed on to the Romans; who, with feeblér powers of genuine imagination, produced, in Virgil and others, new masters in the same essential style. Even the revolution of the ancient world by the Christian theology, and the addition of a considerable leaven of the Teutonic element to the society of the southern and central nations of Europe, did not overcome the classic method of art where it had taken possession. In Dante, mediæval Italy produced a man greater in force of imagination than any ancient Roman, and whose imagination yet worked in the true southern manner, the clear and rigorous definition of the concrete. Spain, whose greatest man of letters was Cervantes, expended what was left of her, after the deduction of his genius, in dramas bearing marks of her Latin lineage. The French, whose claim to be a more imaginative people than the cold and mercantile English is founded on an incorrigible mistake as to what imagination is, have exhibited their deficiency in creative genius in the fact that, with so many intellectual magnates of the first rank in other departments, they have not produced one poet so great that the rest of the world will call him great. The man of greatest creative genius, in the true sense, that France has produced, is neither Corneille nor Racine, but that wild compound of filth and flashing insight—Rabelais. Now both in Cervantes and in Rabelais there is discernible a species of imagination not discernible in either the Spanish or the French dramatists—suggesting that there was a new spirit at work in modern European Literature. This spirit

is seen most purely, however, in its native and original home, the Literature of the Teutonic nations. Since the Greek, the Teuton was the first man who came upon the world so situated that he could take absolutely his own way in thinking of it. As unlike the Greek as the clear skies and vineyards of the warmer are unlike the seamounts and forests of the colder latitudes, this Adam of the north gazed on life and nature, in the full faith of his rich and complex instincts, unawed by Homer, and untaught by Aristotle. Out of the activity of this new power applied to the same everlasting materials has sprung the Literature of the Teutonic nations, of which Shakspeare is the acknowledged prince. Slowly evolved by its own efforts, and even largely affected by the influence of the classic upon it during its evolution, this Literature has still maintained its indigenous character, and has exhibited that character most of all in its specimens of poetic art. And in what does this character consist? It consists in more of melancholy, more of humour, more of mysticism, more of reverent forthgoing upon the minutiae and smaller pulsations as well as upon the massive objects and larger processes of nature and life; and above all, if indeed this does not include all, in more of the reflective, inquisitive, and discursive spirit at all times and occasions—more of the tendency to pour out, in the act of imagining a thing, all the purely intellectual secretion of the moment, so as, by this very suffusion of self upon the outward, to complicate the relation between nature and man. This is that very spirit of *recherche* to which Guizot objects in Shakspeare. Shakspeare could not reach forth his hand to touch a mental object before him but the whole intervening space of atmosphere fell down in flakes of thought. He reached the object, nevertheless; and the imaginative act was none the less real, none the less natural and artist-like, for the rich intellectual precipitation which accompanied it. It was no tinge of barbarism, therefore, in Shakspeare that led him to that confusion of the comic and tragic, and that excess and waste of intellectualism, for which he has been called in question. It was but his greatness as a practitioner in the Teutonic form of art—a form different from the older form, but as legitimate. Nay, and that this Teutonic form of art is now to be regarded as the superior, ought, we think, to be clear from the fact, that it is the later; from the fact, that it appreciates and recognises, and can even practise the other, while the other objects to and cannot practise it; from the fact, that it has already so far superseded

the other by its greater accordance with the spirit and circumstances of modern humanity; and from the fact, that the race to whom it is native, being masters of the greatest portion of the Earth physically, would have the right of appointing, even if they could not supply, the Earth's intellectual king.

-
- ART. V.—1. *A History of the Hebrew Monarchy.* By FRANCIS W. NEWMAN. London, Chapman, 1847.
2. *The Creed of Christendom: its Foundation and Superstructure.* By WILLIAM RATHBONE GREG. London, Chapman, 1851.
3. *A Lecture on the Historic Evidence of the Authorship and Transmission of the Books of the New Testament.* By S. P. TREGELLES, LL.D. London, Bagster, 1852.
4. *The Restoration of Belief.* Parts I. and II. Cambridge, Macmillan, 1852.
5. *Der Christliche Glaube.* Von Dr. FRIEDRICH SCHLEIERMACHER. 2 Bände. Berlin, 1822.
6. *Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung der Christlichen Kirche durch die Apostel.* Von Dr. AUGUST NEANDER. 2^{ter} Band. Hamburg, Perthes, 1833.
7. *System der Christlichen Lehre.* Von Dr. CARL IMMANUEL NITZSCH. 5^{te} Auflage. Bonn, 1844.
8. *Das Leben Jesu Christi.* Von Dr. AUGUST NEANDER. 4^{te} Auflage. Hamburg, 1845.
9. *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christliche Wissenschaft und Christliches Leben.* Nos. 16, 17, 18, 42, 43, 44,—1850. *Die Inspirations-Lehre.* Von Dr. A. THOLUCK. No. 50,—1850. *Die Schule von Genf. Eine Berichtigung.* Von Prof. Dr. MERLE D'AUBIGNE. No. 21,—1851. *Ueber Inspiration Eine Entgegnung.* Von Dr. RUDOLF STIER. Berlin, Wiegandt und Grieben.
10. *La Critique et La Foi.* Deux Lettres. Par EDMOND SCHERER. Paris, Ducloux, 1850.
11. *The Doctrine of Plenary Inspiration; and the Errors of M. Scherer of Geneva.* By COUNT AGENOR DE GASPARIN. Translated by the Rev. J. MONTGOMERY, A.M. Edinburgh, Johnstone and Hunter, 1852.
12. *Die Reden des Herrn Jesu.* Von RUDOLF STIER. 1^{ter} Band. 2^{te} Auflage. Barmen, 1852. 2^{te}—6^{te} Band. 1844—48. 1^{te} Auflage.

13. *Theologische Studien und Kritiken. Das Wesen des Christenthums und die Mystik.* Von Dr. CARL ULLMANN. Hamburg, Perthes, 1852. 3^{ter} Heft.
14. *Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit.* By S. T. COLERIDGE. London, Pickering, 1849.
15. *The Philosophy of Religion.* By J. D. MORELL, A.M. London, Longman, 1849.
16. *Inspiration in Conflict with Recent Forms of Philosophy and Scepticism.* A Lecture by JOHN EADIE, D.D. 2d Edition. Edinburgh, Oliphant, 1849.
17. *The Authority and Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures.* A Lecture by the Rev. R. S. CANDLISH, D.D. London, Nisbet, 1851.
18. *A Lecture on the Inspiration of the Holy Scriptures, delivered at the Opening of the New College, London.* By J. HARRIS, D.D. London, Jackson and Walford, 1851.
19. *The Elements of the Gospel Harmony.* By BROOKE FOSS WESTCOTT, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge, Macmillan, 1851.
20. *Theopneustie: ou Inspiration Plenièrè des Saintes Ecritures.* Par L. GAUSSEN. 2^{me} Edition. Paris, Delay, 1842.

THE orthodoxy of our fathers, amid many minor diversities and modifications, held fast to three propositions on the subject of our Sacred Books: *First*, That they embody a Divine Revelation; *Secondly*, That they exhaust that Revelation; and, *Thirdly*, That they contain it in a form of absolute purity.

To these three propositions—as unimpaired by all recent attacks, and as alike superior to the menace of foes and the indecisive apologies of friends—we give in our cordial adhesion, and count it no shame, but a signal felicity and honour, with the evidence which lies before us, to hold up our every-day Bible, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation, as the genuine and infallible Word of God. It is a cheap and easy thing to defend this belief, on the ground of mere tradition, and to repel every sceptical questioning of revelation, every insinuation against the integrity of the canon of Scripture, every suspicion of the infallible accuracy of our Biblical records, as in itself profane and blasphemous. Such a homage to the infallibility of the Bible would itself require a personal inspiration to redeem it from presumption and wilful blindness. An admissible protest in behalf of the Bible implies something like extensive and close inquiry; and while no one can pretend to have ex-

hausted every argument, tested every fact, and weighed every difficulty in connexion with a body of documents so voluminous and so enveloped in the dust of controversy, nothing less goes to such a confession of faith than the honest conviction, gathered from the study of all sides of the question, that the long venerated doctrine of the infallibility of the Bible has not been appreciably weakened at any point by all the freedom of recent speculation, or the results of modern historical and critical investigation. It is our present purpose, without entering into an abstract and independent discussion of the subject of Inspiration, to examine the claims and pretensions of some leading theories, both British and Continental; and to indicate, not in the way of chronological development, but of moral grouping, the different bearings of the principal views that have lately occupied and disturbed not only our own country, but likewise Germany, Switzerland, and France. Such a bird's-eye view, however hastily executed, may perhaps throw some light on the position and prospects of Christianity at the present day, and shew, on the one hand, how certain the infallibility of the Bible is, as a matter of historical evidence, and more especially how, on the other hand, recent departures from it end in inconsistencies with themselves, and with those admitted principles of judgment that must determine all questions of fact, whether of a natural or supernatural character.

One of the new phases of the controversy respecting Inspiration is, that it has ceased to be a controversy among the orthodox. Till our own days those opposed to Christianity as a supernatural revelation disclaimed the use of such words as Inspiration in their nomenclature, and denounced the whole idea which they embody, as mystical and superstitious. Latterly, however, it has become quite the fashion, as all the world knows, for the successors of the sceptical writers of last century to deal largely in confessions of faith respecting the Bible, which include the doctrine of its inspiration, and almost to outbid the orthodox in their eulogies upon the divine afflatus by which it was produced. The school of Parker, Newman, and Greg, afford the most singular examples of this innovation.* Mr. Greg, whose critical accuracy on such a question is, we must say, not of the highest, as is indicated by his confounding in the first

* We introduce the works of Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg in this article, though these were formerly considered in this Journal in connexion with a different question. (See *North British Review*, No. XXXI.)

page of his "Creed of Christendom," the *plenary* with its ancient opposite the *verbal* inspiration of the Scriptures, stoutly contends that the unorthodox use of inspiration is as correct as the other, and that the theologians have perverted the word from its original application in order to baptize their own dogma; nay more, that having had the inspiration of the Bible conceded in the one sense, they have, too often dishonestly, taken advantage of the ambiguity of language to give it currency in its rigid dogmatic form. What, then, is the true inspiration of the Bible which these writers have rescued out of the hands of Jewish Rabbis and Christian Schoolmen, and restored to its ancient simplicity? According to Mr. Greg, "it is that elevation of all the spiritual faculties by the action of God upon the heart, which is shared by all devout minds, though in different degrees, and which is consistent with infinite error." (P. 22.) Or, as he elsewhere expresses it, "Every great and good man possesses some portion of God's truth to proclaim to the world and to fructify in his own bosom. In a true and simple, but not the orthodox sense, we believe all the pure, wise, and mighty in soul, to be inspired, and to be inspired for the instruction, advancement, and elevation of mankind." (P. 235.) He also quotes Mr. Parker with approbation, who in his usual rhetorical style thus writes, "Inspiration is the consequence of a faithful use of our faculties. Each man is its subject; God its source; truth its only test. Men may call it miraculous, but nothing is more natural. It is co-extensive with the faithful use of man's natural powers. Now, this inspiration is limited to no sect, age, or nation. It is wide as the world, and common as God. It is not given to a few men in the infancy of the world to monopolize inspiration, and bar God out of the soul." (P. 236.)

This liberal theory, it is apparent, identifies inspiration with elevated genius, and regards the Bible as nothing more than the fruit of the religious organization of its writers. The connexion of God with such inspiration of the Bible is moreover the same with his originating influence in all products of mental greatness. "When it is his will," Mr. Greg seems to say, "that mankind should make some great step forward, should achieve some pregnant discovery, he calls into being some cerebral organization of more than ordinary magnitude and power, as that of David, Isaiah, Plato, Shakspeare, Bacon, Newton, Luther, Pascal, which gives birth to new ideas and grander conceptions of the truths vital to humanity." (P. 226.)

According to this view, the Bible is the highest product of man's natural religious faculties operating with peculiar advantage in the most favourable periods of Old Testament history, and more especially in the person of Jesus of Nazareth, who, partly by native endowment, and partly by happy selection from pre-existing materials, over-topped all religionists before and since, and even became, as Mr. Parker has expressed it, "the possibility of the race made real."

We will not be uncandid enough to charge the adherents of this, which may be called the theory of NATURAL INSPIRATION, with intentional abuse of language, or with a too great readiness to blunt the edge of popular prejudice, by conceding to the Scriptures an inspiration in words which is denied in reality. Mr. Greg especially is absolved from any such charge, as, however inconsistent it may seem with the passage in his work already referred to, he applies the word inspiration to this natural power of genius somewhat reluctantly, and seems willing to leave both the name and thing in the ancient sense to less intrepid thinkers than himself. Only, as this theory has of late made considerable noise by its virtual coincidence with the speculations or ejaculations of Mr. Carlyle—as it nearly takes up the ground on which almost all German rationalists, from Paulus to Strauss, are at one—and as it seems to have absorbed the theology of the Unitarian community in this country, if not in America, to the denial of anything special and positive in the mission of Jesus, according to the antiquated views of Priestley and Channing, we may be excused for making some passing observations upon it, though, strictly speaking, it is not so much a theory of inspiration as a negation of the fact. We shall confine ourselves to an expression of complaint as to the style in which the arguments of the orthodox* in favour of positive revelation are got rid of, and of wonder at the results which are brought out by the new system.

It may be made a preliminary matter of complaint that these writers profess to weigh and canvass at all the alleged evidence of revelation, as a *supernatural system embodied in writings*, as if the evidence offered were admissible, while at the same time they have made up their minds that *no* argument can establish *any* miracle or supernatural communication. These advocates of an inspiration which Hobbes and Bolingbroke would have scouted as visionary, have adopt-

* We use the term "orthodox" purely for the sake of distinction; and can intend no arrogance by adopting a designation which has been of late so lightly spoken of.

ed apparently a doctrine of the abstract impossibility of a miraculous revelation from which the writers we have named would have shrunk as rash and unphilosophical. Wherever Mr. Newman alights on a miracle, it is forthwith, as *in itself* incredible, resolved into a myth, and Mr. Greg has expended pages of logic to prove, what certainly is not self-evident, that the faculty to *comprehend* a revelation implies the faculty, sooner or later, to *make* it; and hence, that a discovery truly supernatural is absolutely impossible. (Pp. 230-233.) To us, it seems hardly necessary to illustrate the fallacy, not to say absurdity of this doctrine.

Were a person to predict the return of Sir John Franklin's ships upon a certain day of next year, and to follow up the prediction by an account of the form of government in France and the name of the chief governor in 1872, would Mr. Greg maintain that the power to comprehend the latter prediction implied the power to make it, and that the power to believe it, after the first was verified, brought it within the range of discoverable truths. Be the evidence of supernatural revelation in the Bible sufficient or insufficient, it is surely not fair to make a profession of candour in weighing it, and to lament the hard necessity of rejecting it on account of its imperfections, when the very gate of evidence is barred by such preconceptions. Instead of leading us through a long blind alley of *critical* objections to the divinity of the Pentateuch and the Gospels, it would be better to write up at once—"No thoroughfare." Whole treatises, like De Wette's *Introduction* and Strauss' *Leben Jesu* would then be superseded by a few strokes of natural metaphysics; or, if criticism were at all superadded, the grave deduction which must be made in all moral questions from the arguments of the reasoner, who is thus bound to find for only one side, would be at once apparent and easy.

Another ground of complaint is, that the internal evidence of the Bible for its own inspiration in the orthodox sense, is not only suppressed, but turned the other way, by an obstinate misreading of its contents. Denying, setting aside, and even sneering at everything preternatural in the Old Testament, Mr. Newman, in his "*History of the Hebrew Monarchy*," still attempts to construct the facts, after all their high and glorious motives have been withdrawn. Nothing is left for him, rejecting the entire Mosaic groundwork of the Jewish system, but to write down the succeeding history as a succession of feuds, massacres, and impositions, with only occasional gleams of natural

piety and elevated fanaticism to gild the darkness. Having disenchanting the Old Testament of its theocracy, it is easy to expose its narratives to the critical scalping-knife. *The living voice of God was the grand justification of the entire system.* It is the same with the history of Christians still. It is either sublime or it is ridiculous. And an exact parallel to Mr. Newman's "history" of the Old Testament kings and prophets would be found in a biography of a great spirit, such as Luther or Whitefield, in which every superhuman influence was denied, and the remaining phenomena set down to the account of vanity, obstinacy, and self-will, with a sufficient admixture of eccentric benevolence and enthusiasm to give the portrait some faint resemblance. Mr. Greg, too, removing the miraculous foundation of the New Testament system, necessarily stumbles at a thousand points in the life of our Saviour and his disciples, abolishes altogether the grand coherent features in the image of "God manifest in the flesh," stigmatizes as bigotry and arrogance the decisive and imperial style which must belong to a divine communication, explains the gift of tongues as madness, and the self-sacrificing and world-renouncing spirit of the primitive Church as due only to a frenzied expectation of the end of all things; and in short, having reduced the doctrine of Jesus to the elements of natural religion, and himself to the most gifted of mere human teachers, is compelled to search among the baser tendencies of human nature to account for that appearance of inflation, pomposity, and convulsive excitement, amid which Christianity was ushered into the world.

But the most serious ground of complaint of all is to be found in the unauthorized and arbitrary manner in which these advocates of natural inspiration set aside the positive external evidence of the Bible, that they may at once bring it down to their own standard. The very strength of the orthodox doctrine lies in the proof that the Old Testament, and later records, were contemporaneous or immediately subsequent to the events which they chronicle. The reception of the books is thus a guarantee for the facts, miraculous as they are, and these miraculous facts in turn accredit the professed inspiration of the writers. This, so far from being a circle, as has been sometimes inconsiderately represented, is a strong chain of linked demonstration, which no efforts of Naturalism can ever break asunder. Hence, with instinctive recoil from the neighbourhood of the supernatural, the whole company of rationalist critics, among whom are first those of Germany, arbitrarily wrest and

torture every sacred writing out of its place, and separate it by an interval from its subject, so adjusting it anew, that the supernatural inference shall be impossible; by a curious law not sufficiently adverted to, making the event repel the history, and attract the prophecy of itself. The result is those singular dislocations, transpositions, and shiftings of the sacred books from their ancient moorings by whole centuries, in regard to which no German critic is at one with his brother, but all agree that no book must be landed beneath the shadow of a miracle, or at a distance from the fulfilment of any prophecy. This play of German intellect with the Pentateuch, the Isaian prophecies, and the gospels, utterly discordant in everything but the *πρωτον ψευδος* of the system, forms a melancholy chapter in the aberrations of human learning, and on a question of purely literary criticism, would not have been tolerated. As it is, in a country where every scholar is tempted to fight his way by paradoxes, where extravagant scepticism alternates with blind credulity as almost a part of the national character, where the sense of the supernatural has (or rather *had*) to a mournful extent died out, and the public mind is untrained by any rigid institutional discipline in the examination of evidence, such tendencies have become epidemic to deny every scriptural book to its reputed author, and to push every document from its traditional seat. A few supposed traces of a later style—a handful of anachronisms easily explicable on the supposition of a revisal—the very prophecies themselves which it contains, have been eagerly laid hold of to thrust down the Pentateuch to the last ages of the Jewish monarchy. The consenting tradition of the Jews, enhanced by their scrupulous care of their sacred books, and their critical skill, too, as shewn in the rejection of the Old Testament Apocrypha—the accordant testimony of the most ancient memorials, such as the passover—the stones of Gilgal—the brazen serpent—and many others, which no rationalism ventures to assign to so late an origin as the supposititious date in question—the independent existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch—the corroborations of profane history, and the voice of the monuments of Egypt, to say nothing of the beautiful continuity of the grave and majestic narrative itself, all go for nothing with critics like De Wette, who can cut up the history of the deluge into separate and ill-adjusted strata, and coolly dissect the story of Joseph and his brethren into incongruous portions, clumsily pieced together by a recent artist. In this school of historical criticism, both

Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg are catechumens, looking up with profound reverence to the “science” of its masters, and adopting their negative conclusions and paradoxes, as if they never had been contradicted or refuted.*

Mr. Newman, for example, regards it as demonstrated that the Pentateuch first received a collective existence in the reign of Josiah, and that the book of Deuteronomy having been then forged by Hilkiah the priest, to uphold Levitical influence, and as a *coup d'état* against the “high places” and their adherents, was palmed on the young king as the autograph of Moses discovered in

* To one at all read in German criticism, its best contradiction is furnished by itself. As an example of that “concordia discors” which annuls itself, we may quote the terms in which Ewald, the “magnus Apollo” of Mr. Newman, speaks of De Wette, the admired of Mr. Theodore Parker and Mr. Greg. In his epilogue to his work on the Poetical Books of the Old Testament, Ewald, after a high eulogium on his own Commentary on the Psalms, thus delivers himself in reply to some hostile criticism of his rival. “How has De Wette received this work which first appeared in 1835? The pen is ready to drop from my hands, when I call up the full image of the miserable half-and-half style of criticism, so replete with crudity and vanity, and the views at once stale, confused, and groundless, which he there propounds. As he does not understand that most important psalm, the 51st, he does not scruple to call the right interpretation an immoral one, thus degrading the sacred writer himself. Was he restrained by no scruple, no doubt, no blush of shame? Did it not occur to such a universal doubter to doubt whether he was just in his strictures on others? And if his critical procedure, which is a mere compound of superficial scepticism and pretended accuracy, was perhaps explicable if not excusable in 1806, (for to real worth and fruitfulness it has never had any great claim,) how does he not perceive that its day is gone by, and that Old Testament science has long left it in the rear?” Amidst a good deal more to the same purpose, it is charged on De Wette that his method is the true cause of the decline and fall of “science” in interpretation; that he “stands stock-still in the midst of that confusion and scepticism of his which separate him from truth, and cannot penetrate or even approach the sanctuary, and loses his temper when others refuse to stay with him in darkness.” “His earlier writings,” it is stated, “are not without some good views, though often very confused, and even his Introduction to the Old Testament is a completely unsatisfactory book.” This is wound up by the declaration of Ewald, that though he had been prevailed on to look for an hour or two into the last edition of De Wette’s Commentary on the Psalms only by the solicitation of a friend, he could prove every charge by a superfluity of evidence. Squabbles like these, making every abatement for temper, are worthy of consideration in some quarters. The list of fundamental diversities among the masters of “critical science,” might be indefinitely enlarged. It seems that the *odium theologicum* is not limited by the circle of orthodoxy; and that the magnates of Germany are by their own shewing not incapable of what Mr. Greg calls “clerical reasoning.” It is creditable, however, to De Wette, as we learn from Lucke’s “Reminiscences,” that he repaid these taunts with kindness.

the temple. The intrinsic credibility of this origin, any competent judge of the melting pathos and sublime moral tone of Deuteronomy (for which, however, Mr. Newman has a singular contempt) may pronounce upon. Mr. Newman reasons that if Deuteronomy had existed the people could not so grievously have disobeyed its precepts, an argument of the same kind as that which would prove the non-existence of our British Statutes from the mass of national crime, or make out that our Protestant Bible was forged at the time of the Reformation, because so much existed till then in the teeth of its prohibitions. It is also contended that the young king's ignorance of the book proved its non-existence; but it is not stated in the record that he was absolutely ignorant of it, and his profound emotion on the discovery may be reasonably explained by the presence of a document so venerable and awful. We cannot enter, however, into details of this kind. Enough may be found in the works of Hengstenberg and Havernick, not to mention others, to dissipate this and kindred theories. Of these works, however, and similar fair and learned replies to German and British assaults on the Pentateuch, we should infer Mr. Newman to be ignorant, were we willing to reason on his own principles—that whatever is not mentioned where it might be expected, is not known to have any existence.

Mr. Greg fully coincides with the masterly arguments of his precursor in regard to the Old Testament, and while lamenting that so great and distressing a work should have been laid upon him, he is yet prepared, relying on the impregnable science of De Wette and Strauss, to unsettle the "creed of christendom," respecting the authenticity and inspiration of the gospels. We are compelled loudly to protest against every step of his argumentation, and, looking to the tokens of haste and deficient consideration too frequently visible in a work of so grave a nature, sincerely hope that such a style of criticism may long remain an exotic on English soil. The Gospel of Matthew, though supported by unbroken tradition from the end of the first century, and read, according to undeniable evidence, from the beginning, as one of four gospels, in all Christian assemblies, is denied to be his, chiefly on the ground (internal evidence apart) of the subordinate difference as to whether it was written in Greek or Hebrew; as if the consent of the Church to receive a gospel as his, and to read it under that character, did not make it perfectly indifferent in respect of its testimony in what language it was written, or whether we have the

original or a translation. The same singular parallogism appears in discrediting the two other synoptical gospels, because we cannot trace them to their sources, or explain their relation to each other; as if a compiler collecting many accounts of eye-witnesses were necessarily less accurate than these eye-witnesses, and that even though his narratives in turn were vouched for and pushed into currency by their exertions, as was certainly the case with the Gospels of Mark and Luke. Doubt is cast on the testimony of Papias to the Gospel of Mark, as the work of the companion of Peter, (p. 84,) because, as is the wonted cry, Papias was a man of weak mind, and because, as Dr. Middleton tells us, Irenaeus makes Papias a disciple of John the Apostle, whereas Eusebius styles him a disciple of John the Presbyter; as if it required strong mind to vouch for a literary work, as Mr. Greg, for example, does for that of Middleton, or as if Mr. Greg's certificate to Dr. Middleton might be disputed, because two other people happened, in writing about himself, to disagree as to the place of the publication of his book, whether it was London or Manchester. The most inexcusable, however, of Mr. Greg's criticisms on the genuineness of the gospels, is on that of John. There is not a single external argument to invalidate this time-hallowed authorship. The observation of Olshausen is strictly true, that the Gospel of John is the best attested book in the whole world. Manuscripts, ancient versions, fathers, heretics like Valentinus, unbelievers like Celsus, *pleno ore* attest it. Bretschneider was about the first, thirty years ago, to assail its genuineness on internal grounds in his "*Probabilia de evangelii et epistolarum Joannis apostoli indole et origine*." The weight of counter evidence compelled him, much to his honour, speedily to retract his position; and it were to have been wished that Strauss who took up the forlorn hope thus deserted, but who was obliged too to abandon it, though to the manifest destruction of his favorite mythical theory, had remained steadfast in his conversion for once, if not to reason, at least to forbearance. Even De Wette, strongly tempted as he was by constitutional temperament to yield to the arguments of Strauss, a temperament which led him to sacrifice everything which had once been bitten by any rabid tooth of scepticism, was constrained to stand on the defensive, and to affirm "that the recognition of the Johannine origin of this gospel, even after the most violent attacks of recent times, will ever remain the current belief of the Church."*

* *Kurze Erklärung des Evangeliums Johannis*, p. 8.

the procedure of Mr. Greg is instructive. He sets down the arguments of Bretschneider as almost decisive, being probably ignorant of his retraction, and then balancing against each other the sole authorities of De Wette and Strauss, (of whom, in regard to this gospel, he freely speaks as the "best critics," "the most eminent critics," to the exclusion of all others,) he coolly adds, "where such men doubt, assuredly it is not for us to dogmatize." Then finding the Gospel of John different from what he imagined it should have been, or ought to have been, and indulging in various other censures of the writer, he comes to the conclusion, that "if it was the work of an apostle at all, it was of an apostle who had only caught a small fragment of his Master's mantle," (p. 145,) "if it were the production of the Apostle John, it was written at a time when either from defect of memory, redundancy of imagination, or laxity in his notions of an historian's duty, he allowed himself to take strange liberties with fact," (p. 210.) Thus Mr. Greg has two strings to his bow. Either way the gospel must be discredited. If its genuineness cannot be overthrown, its authority must be written down, because it does not suit his own ideas of apostolic wisdom. But it is not our question at present, how the gospels, and this among them, may be vindicated in respect to their contents. Neither is it needful to ask why Mr. Greg should on this subject, as in several other places, openly contradict himself, by assigning the first epistle to John, and asserting it as highly probable that the gospel and epistle had the same origin. If the genuineness of the gospels remains untouched, no license of censure, founded on their contents, can ever prevail against them. The only reasonable inference, in such circumstances, must be that men are against the gospels, because the gospels are against their favourite opinions. We shall therefore pass over the muster roll of discrepancies, incoherences, blunders, fictions, and even forgeries, (Mr. Greg absolves the synoptists from "want of honesty" only "in the great majority of instances," (p. 137,) and speaks of the fourth gospel as "throughout an unscrupulous and most inexact paraphrase of Christ's teaching,"—(p. 157,) with which the evangelists are alleged to have dishonoured themselves and disgraced their Master. Nor shall we be tempted to discuss Mr. Greg's singular comments upon the evangelic narratives of the resurrection. He appears to believe no more than that a young man appeared in white, who pointed out to the women the Saviour's empty tomb. This he believes, because the Gospel of Mark, which

ought to end (though no critical Greek Testament makes it end) with the 8th verse of the 16th chapter, has asserted no more, and the narratives disagree on all other points. The excited imaginations of the Apostles, ready to receive anything so joyful, (though Mr. Greg elsewhere contends that the Saviour had not given them the least hint he should rise again,) "mistook some passing individual for their crucified Lord, and from such an origin multiplied rumours of his reappearance rose and spread," (p. 217.) Mr. Greg does not definitively adopt this opinion; but he regards it with no disfavour, and it seems to be the best that he can propose. This shows at least that the orthodox have not the monopoly of faith; and that those who regard this view with favour have little reason to apologize for the disciples, as "not men of critical, inquiring, or doubting minds," (p. 218.) We thought that there had been a Thomas among them, and that they were all slow to believe. We thought that there had been a whole legion of unbelievers in Jerusalem where the resurrection was immediately preached, and preached so as to imply a charge of murder, ready to put the figment down by unmasking the young man in white, or exposing the Saviour's dead body. We thought that, upon the testimony of Paul, which Mr. Greg himself cannot reject, there were 500 persons, many of them still living, who saw the Saviour at one time. All this goes for nothing, unless some original document, containing the written testimony, it is now said of two, now of four, and now of at least six witnesses, is handed down from age to age, attesting a personal vision; though it might, one would think, appear, that the testimony of John in the 20th chapter of his gospel, which includes other ten, and the manifold other testimonies, are virtually not less present to us than if we heard them with our own ears. And thus with the most relentless rigour in testing history and the most charitable laxity in constructing hypotheses, the resurrection of Jesus, the watchword of sternly sincere and intensely practical men, the fact which, proclaimed in broad-day light with trumpet clearness and vindicated against all comers at the expense of the dearest life's-blood, overturned two mighty religions and revolutionized the world, vanishes away into a white mist, an apparition of the dawn which must now sink back into darkness.

Having thus freely expressed our dissatisfaction with the grounds on which this "critical" school dismisses and casts aside the old supernaturalist views of inspiration, we may be pardoned some expression of

astonishment at the style in which they develop their own. The highest utterances of God in man—such products of genius as mark the culminating point of the religious instincts and faculties of our race—might expect to be treated with something of the kneeling veneration with which the worshippers of Homer, Plato, Raphael, and Handel approach their masterpieces. It is with a grievous surprise that we encounter in this class of writings an unaccountable want of respect towards these highest products of “the religious consciousness,” and even a frequent sarcastic stroke, as if their authors could not forget the old grudge they had borne against them when they did battle on the orthodox side. They seem to have known the Bible so much as a foe in its supernatural form, that when it is converted to Naturalism they can hardly treat it as a friend. Mr. Newman’s book is a grand corrective of Old Testament prejudices, bigotries, and religious illusions—such an account of Jewish men and things, as a Carthaginian might have written of the Roman heroes of the second Punic war. It is a re-opening of the issue between David and the heathen chiefs, the kings of Judah and the kings of Israel, Hezekiah and Sennacherib, with the fixed result of reversing every verdict of the Jewish books, and bringing off the culprits not guilty.* It is a general jail-delivery of Old Testament criminals—such as Jeroboam, Ahab, Ahaz; and even Jezebel, Athaliah, and Manasseh come in for redeeming words and charitable sympathies. Such a seeking out of the neglected and remembering of the forgotten, such a circumnavigation of philanthropy has not been known for many a day. The exaltation of the one side is naturally followed by the depression of the other. The prophets are the troublers of Israel, the authors by their stupidity, if not their villany, of every great crime and massacre, and of the rupture of the kingdoms. The true, or reputedly true, are much on a level with the false, for some, like Elisha, are movers of rebellion, and others, like Jeremiah, “play into the hands of the public enemy,” (p. 352.) while all alike, if not charlatans, are enthusiasts, consecrating their own fancies by a “thus saith the Lord;” and as for the priests and Levites, like every other clerical body, their aim is power and pelf, to attain which they do not scruple to hood-wink tender-hearted kings by inventing oracles and forging books in the name of Moses. Every eulogy has

some reservation; every compliment some sting in its tail. Of David we are told, that all the “brilliancy alike of his chivalry and of his piety is sullied, and cold minds suspect his religious raptures of hypocrisy,” (p. 112.) The prophets, from Joel to Isaiah, are only lauded at the expense of their successors. Isaiah’s usual strain is “grandiloquent,” and of his confessedly splendid prophecy against Sennacherib, it is condescendingly remarked, that “we *still* read it with interest and admiration,” (pp. 278, 300.) Still, “his natural note” was “harsh,” and up to his “swan-song” the oracle respecting Egypt, “when his bosom expanded to embrace Gentile enemies,” he had “the contracted heart of a mere Jew,” (p. 308.) And this is the nation—these its noblest spirits—these the masterpieces of its literature, towards which Mr. Newman, resuming the attitude of worship in the peroration of his book, tells us that “Judea was the well-spring of religious wisdom to a world besotted by frivolous or impure fancies”—that as “to the Greeks it was given to develop beauty and science—to the Romans jurisprudence and municipal rule, so to the Jews it was given to develop the holiness of God, and his sympathy towards his chosen servants,” and that while the prophets “groaned over the monstrous fictions which imposed on the nations under the name of religion, they announced that out of Zion should go forth the law and the word of Jehovah,” (p. 370.) Whence then Mr. Newman’s systematic and even ludicrous depreciation in detail of this Jewish inspiration? Judea was the well-spring of religious wisdom: yet Jewish judgments of almost everything need to be reversed. They developed the holiness of God and his sympathy with his chosen servants: but this holiness they dishonoured by odious immoralities, and their idea that they were God’s chosen servants was mere bigotry and delusion. The prophets groaned over the fictions which imposed on the nations; yet from Samuel downward, who pretended a divine commission for the anointing of Saul, which in his heart he disliked, they too often lied and forged oracles to impose upon their own. Does Mr. Newman not see the intellectual obliquity of this procedure? Does he not see that while dilating on and exaggerating discrepancies in the books of Kings and Chronicles, his own book is a stupendous contradiction? The ribaldry of Paine itself is a relief, logically speaking, compared with this combination of kissing and smiting under the fifth rib. Nor will the English mind endure to have the record of mingled delusion and knavery, wrong-

* The same must be said of the Hebrew estimate of Samuel *versus* Saul, which Mr. Newman would reverse if the facts bearing against Samuel were not arbitrarily set aside.

headedness and cruelty, which Mr. Newman's reading of Jewish history exhibits, decorated with the frontispiece of a temple, and the blazonry of inspiration.

Similar criticisms are made by Mr. Greg upon the persons and books of the New Testament, wherein, conjointly or severally, some kind of inspiration is notwithstanding allowed by him to reside. The style in which the evangelists are handled we have already remarked. The apostles fare no better. They had "angry contentions" among themselves, (p. 164.) They were the dupes of the prevailing delusion that the Holy Spirit was at work in the gift of tongues, and on this ground, enlarged the strictly Jewish limits within which their master had confined them "in a singular and inconclusive manner," (p. 178.) Peter had no better foundation than a dream, which was the result of hunger, for giving to Christianity a cosmopolitan character, (p. 169.) Paul taught "confused and contradictory notions on the subject of marriage;" and "there is much in the tone of his doctrinal writings which we believe and feel to be at variance, or at least little in harmony with the views and spirit of Jesus," (pp. 183, 190.) John, in his first epistle, "abounds in denunciations, all too redolent of the temper of the apostle who wished to call down fire from heaven on an unbelieving village," (p. 154.) James alone, whose epistle (marvellous to relate) Mr. Greg willingly receives as genuine, "is one who had drank in the spirit and appreciated the lessons of the meek, practical, and spiritual Jesus," (p. 185.) But why speak of these and similar criticisms on the disciples, when the critic permits himself to adopt the style he applies to the Master? There is much veneration, indeed, professed, and we do not dispute that it is honestly felt. Such an error in logic we will readily tolerate as leaves in any man a reverence for Jesus out of which something higher and better may yet grow. But, in a matter of logical criticism, we must deal with Mr. Greg's statements as we find them, and look to their inevitable tendencies. At one time no words are too strong for his admiration of the greatness and wisdom of Jesus, and he sets down to the misrepresentations of the evangelists all those doctrines ascribed to him, which form the "peculiar, startling, perplexing, revolting, and contradictory doctrines of modern orthodoxy,—doctrines which unsophisticated men feel to be horrible and monstrous," (p. 152): such as the necessity of faith to salvation, the sinfulness of unbelief, the Deity of Jesus, and the Atonement. These are too obviously un-

sound to have formed a part of his teaching. And yet, though "the wisest, purest, noblest being that ever clothed thought in the poor language of humanity," (p. 228,) his doctrines were not "so new, so profound, so perfect, so distinctive," as not to be essentially contained in the Old Testament. He "appears to have held erroneous views respecting demoniacal possession, the interpretation of Scripture, his own Messiahship,* his second coming, and the approaching end of the world," (p. 230.) "He neither directed nor contemplated the spread of his gospel beyond the pale of the Jewish nation," (p. 168.) Even his moral system, though "unimprovable and unsurpassable," and "fitted to make earth a paradise," (p. 244,) has some such "radical defect, or incompleteness, or inapplicability in our day and country, that any one who *strictly* regulates his conduct by its teaching (putting aside the mere letter) is immediately led into acts which the world unanimously regards as indicative of an unsound or unbalanced mind," (p. 246.) And then, on some essential points, Christianity, even as Christ left it, is unquestionably a stumbling-block to the wise and reflective of all ages. Thus the doctrine that prayer is answered, as Christ taught it, is "obviously irreconcilable with all that reason and revelation teach us of the divine nature," (p. 248.) The Christian idea of forgiveness which Christ shared, "is unmeaning or blasphemous as applied to Jehovah," (p. 264,) because the forgiveness of sins in any other sense than the abandonment of them is impossible; and to crown all, so far as the evidence goes, "the views of Christ respecting the future world were less in advance of those current in his age and country than his views upon any other topic," and "perhaps even fall short of those attained by some pious Pagans of an earlier date," (p. 280.) Strange blunders and shortcomings these for "the most exalted religious genius whom God ever sent upon the earth—in himself an embodied revelation" (!) (p. 233.) Was it worth while to sift the gospels clear of all "Orthodoxy" and "Calvinism" by so laborious a process, to leave so much chaff still among the wheat? The doctrines of the

* The Messiahship of Jesus Mr. Greg does not seem to know what to make of. At one time Jesus is spoken of as believing himself sent to fulfil the functions of the expected Messiah, (p. 118.) At another time the Messiah expected by the Jews is said to have been "of a character so different and a career so opposite to those of the meek, lowly, long-suffering Jesus, that the passages describing the one never could have been applied to the other without a perversion of ingenuity, and a disloyal treatment of their obvious signification," (p. 62.)

New Testament are destroyed by its own moral teaching like a temple burnt down by a coal from its own altar, and then the hapless coal itself is blown out. A Caesarean operation, fatal to the parent life, is performed on the gospels, to extract from them the genuine Christianity, and then the miserable infant perishes by the hard nursing to which it is subjected!

Upon the whole, this singular tone of apparent reverence and ultimate depreciation with which Mr. Newman and Mr. Greg alike treat the greatest names in Judaism and Christianity, is to us a matter of unfailling wonder; and the singularity and self-contradiction might even be regarded as giving a mythical character to their entire productions. We have met, however, with one fact which, so far as it goes, deserves to be mentioned, as proving such phenomena not altogether unknown to history. Mr. Walpole, in his *Travels among the Anasyrii in Mount Lebanon*, informs us of a man who came suddenly upon a company of that strange people in the midst of the rites of their mysterious worship. They had dressed up a wooden figure into an image of Providence, and this they were assiduously engaged in flogging. The parallel is complete, shewing what deviations from nature may arise without absolute miracle. Here too is the wooden image baptized with the name of a divinity, and the prevailing rite of worship is flagellation.

This theory of inspiration then may be left to fall by its own weight; and we have little doubt that soon the field will be swept clear of its ruins, and the ancient land-mark re-erected between those who regard the Bible as the mere product of imposture and fanaticism, on the one hand, and those who regard it as containing a supernatural revelation from God, on the other. Such an issue is likely to be hastened by some of the works at the head of this Article. The historical argument for the books of the New Testament is very clearly and effectively put by Dr. Tregelles, who re-exhibits the materials of honest old Lardner and of Paley, with the freshness and authority proper to one whose life has been devoted, and not in vain, to the prosecution of original researches, with the view to a critical edition of the New Testament. This tract and the more elaborate treatise of Davidson lately noticed in this Journal, amply show how irrefragable, as mere historic documents, tried by all the ordinary tests of genuineness and authenticity, the sacred books are, and will establish as a necessary corollary their supernatural character, in the case it is to be hoped of all who are not prepared to believe

in any monstrosity short of the miracle of a revelation, or to disallow the heavenly oracle because it does come from heaven, and is higher than our ways and thoughts.

Here, too, rank the ingenious, learned, and eminently candid Tracts, entitled the "*Restoration of Belief*." The First Part of this series is a masterly re-exhibition of the argument from the success of Christianity in its struggle with Paganism, taking the reader back into the bosom of the martyr-Church, laying open the spring of its calm, grave, and indomitable earnestness in witnessing to the gospel facts, and the Person of Christ as the centre of them, and urging the question whether a crisis in the world's advancement, which not only carried through these truths in mortal battle, but gave to all professing faith, and even to disbelief, a moral grandeur unknown before, and thus cast on honest infidelity a ray of heavenly light such as had never before fallen upon it, had its source in "a congeries of exaggerations, and in a mindless conspiracy, hatched by chance, nursed by imposture, and winged by fanaticism," (p. 110.) The Second Tract, with the same calm, invincible logic, pursues the argument through the apostolical Epistles, making good such a *cohesion* between the natural and supernatural element in them that, on the denial of the latter, the apostolic character becomes "a jumble of inconsistencies, to which no semblance of moral or of immoral unity can be given," (p. 219.)

We pass over then to the ranks of the SUPERNATURALISTS, by whom alone, in propriety of speech, theories of "inspiration" can be entertained, and shall endeavour to signalize some of the more noted and influential theorists of recent times. We need not take the trouble of collecting their testimonies to what they hold in common—that Christianity is a supernatural revelation—that that revelation is contained in the Bible, and that there rests upon the Bible in consequence an authority *sui generis*, and such as belongs to no other book in the world. But it immediately strikes us, that through this large, and we trust, (notwithstanding all outcries to the contrary,) increasing class, there runs one great line of division which parts them off into adherents of the Bible in a more lax or in a more strict sense. The most superficial glance discovers two theories more or less opposed to one another—in much it may be in appearance, but in not a little also in reality—forming what may be called the theory of *partial* and the theory of *plenary* inspiration. Under these two rubrics, accordingly, we shall bring the remainder of our critical review.

The two most influential reasoners on the side of partial inspiration which this century has produced are Schleiermacher and Coleridge. The one has acted upon German theology, the other on British and American; and a curious parallel might be drawn between them in respect of more questions than this of inspiration. Our limits require us, however, to restrict ourselves to this one point; and we prefer to begin with Schleiermacher, both as the earlier, and as having carried out his views to more bold and therefore more easily apprehensible results.

Though Schleiermacher was not fond of the name of supernaturalist, and sought by sundry devices of a dialectical kind to break the shock which the admission of a miraculous interference gave to his philosophy, nothing is more clear than that all the good which he effected in Germany was by the restoration of Christianity to its supernaturalist elevation, and by insisting that it is a manifestation of divine truth and grace, infinitely raised above all reasoning, morality, and other pre-existing resources of the world. He did not look, however, on this divine quality as originally communicated in the Bible, but in the Person of Christ, which was to him the grand centre of devout regard, and focus of influence on the spiritual destinies of men. Christ was the word of God, the living word, imparting, so to speak, a magnetic property to those who came in contact with him, more especially his apostles, thus revolutionizing the world by their living example, and not merely by certain articles of faith transmitted to them in a dogmatic shape, and then engrossed in a written document, to be held out to the intellectual reception of mankind. With him Christ is first, the Church second, the Bible last. The Bible is the product of faith, pre-supposes faith to its comprehension, and is in no other sense the work of the Holy Spirit than all succeeding Christian literature, save and except that its separate parts were written by those who, standing nearest the divine Saviour, drank most into his Spirit, and reflected the universal Christian sentiment in relation to Jesus in its highest purity. This normal value of the Bible is not affected by differences of opinion respecting the canon, or the origin of the sacred books themselves. There is enough of unity and certainty in the main to make the rejection of certain writings (Schleiermacher not only himself rejected some of the so-called Deuterocanonical books, but the First Epistle of Timothy) a matter of little moment to Christian faith. There is a sufficient reflection of the divine presence of Christ in the

books themselves to satisfy all the necessities of the Christian consciousness, though some of the gospels may have been compiled from fragments, amid the ordinary liabilities of history to error, and though the epistles were sent forth with no more distinctive aid and guard against defect than lay in the apostolic training and experience of their authors. Hence not only in the critical settlement of the canon and text of Scripture, but also in its interpretation, a large place is to be assigned to Christian consciousness, as the living continuous principle from which the Bible originally proceeded; and in the settlement of the true and divine by this organ, that writing has most authority which bears most directly on Christ and his work, so that the contents of the New Testament have a graduated scale of importance, and the Old Testament has no normal dignity whatever.*

Serviceable as these views were when first propounded, and great as was the stride which they evinced beyond the Kantian estimate of the Bible as a mere legendary vehicle of morality, it will be seen at once, that they allow to the Scriptures a partial and scanty measure of inspiration. We have here the source of a very current formula in Germany, that "God's word is in the Bible; but that *the Bible* is not God's word." Schleiermacher to some extent veiled the imperfections of his own scheme, partly by the admirable eloquence and fervour with which he descanted on what was true in it, *e. g.*, that Christ is the fountain-head of a glorious change in the spiritual life of mankind, and that personal communion with him is necessary to exalt the word above a dead letter; and partly by an ingenious accommodation of his style to Church-formulas of greater rigour and fullness. Yet his theory will not stand the test of anything like that keen examination with which he loved to abate what he regarded as the exaggerations of orthodoxy.

We think it may be admitted that the presumption is against a theory which receives revelation but denies inspiration and infallibility. We are far, however, from wishing to rest much (in point of argument we desire to rest nothing) as has sometimes been done, on mere *a priori* likelihoods and anticipations in regard to so mysterious and sublime a work of God as the giving of a revelation to mankind. Could it be *proved* that revelation extended no farther than Schleiermacher has contended, we for our parts would be thankful for so much; and

* *Glaubenslehre*, vol. ii. pp. 477-509. (1st edition.)

though with a Bible in our hands, much of which was uncertainly divine, and not a little of which was unquestionably uncanonical, we should still have struggled on our way beneath the broken rays that came from the eternal word, hoping at last to reach the goal of so trying a pilgrimage, and to find the explanation of error and defect in the Bible, as we found the explanation of the like staggering phenomena in God's world and in God's Church. Still, a reasonable man will hardly deny that with the idea of a supernatural revelation we more naturally connect that of *a permanent document, which fully partakes of the qualities of that revelation, and secures it for all ages*; and as there is a clear and indisputable miracle at any rate, it seems, so far as can be judged, more suitable and worthy of God to make that miracle complete, and to deposit its results not in a written production, which errs so greatly both by excess and defect, but in a Bible as immaculate as its great subject. Schleiermacher boldly confronts the difficulty of believing in an immaculate Christ. Is it not like an inconsequence to cast away the fruits of this infallibility or let them fall to the ground?

A still greater difficulty is the total inefficiency of the principle according to which we are to separate, in the actual Bible, the valid and ultimate word of God from its admitted imperfections. "Christian consciousness," we are told, is to distinguish, even in the writings of admittedly apostolic men, between what is divine and what bears the mark of human infirmity. And this consciousness is to recognise as sacred whatever treats directly of the person and work of Christ, and to allow a gradually increasing admixture of error in all that lies beyond. We say nothing of the soundness of this rule. What we insist on is *its total inutility*. It is utterly impossible to separate the person of Christ from the whole New Testament theory of creation and providence. Do passages which speak of his pre-existent state and universal natural rule claim our faith or not? Are the discoveries respecting the future life sufficiently connected with his person and work to be absolutely reliable? Where is the boundary between the little and the great in the biographies of the evangelists? Are we with Schleiermacher to regard the alleged doctrine of Jesus respecting demoniacs, as one of the narrator's mistakes, touching, as it did, no vital point; or, rather with Neander, as a true report, since the subject was mixed up with the whole of Christ's work of deliverance from sin and evil? Such questions are endless. But we cannot help

adverting to the Messianic prophecies of the Old Testament, to which Schleiermacher leaves a kind of shadowy dignity amid the dethronement of all besides. As it is confessedly a matter of disputation with him what portions of the Old Testament are to be ranked in this class, we have here a continued problem whether or not *any part* of the Old Testament can be clearly made out to be the word of God at all; and the reverence which is felt for it on this theory, must to some extent resemble that of the Mussulman for the piece of waste paper, on which he refuses to tread lest it should contain a part of the Koran; or if this be thought extreme, the language must hold which was applied to the Samaritan idea of the Old Testament, "Ye worship ye know not what."

But by far the most formidable and indeed utterly insuperable objection to this theory of partial inspiration, is *its contrariety to the distinct, emphatic, and universal utterance of the Bible respecting itself*. This is, after all, the turning-point of the argument. Uncertain as this doctrine makes the boundary of canonical Scripture, and also how much of the canon is infallible, there is enough of unchallengeable Scripture (we here speak of it as a mere historical document) left over by this theory to overthrow itself from the foundations. The principle that authority in teaching belongs to the companions of Christ, as the result merely of his life-long action on their minds, is opposed by the whole history of the prejudices and errors of the apostles, down to the time of Christ's death. It is also incompatible with the history of Paul, whose authority Schleiermacher admits, but lamely enough attempts to harmonize with his view. If we do not tear the whole gospel record asunder, and do violence to the inductive principles by which all history should be studied, it was not the mere presence of Christ, but the operation of the Holy Ghost, that led the apostles into all truth; and though that truth was connected with Himself, much of it had not during his life-time dawned on their minds, for he had many things to say which they could not then bear, and which they were yet to teach the world. His own motto was—"I have given unto them the *words* which thou gavest me;" and though his glorious divine example had also its influence, this is not to be disjoined from that doctrine of which he spoke as coming from God, and that truth which was able to make free. It was not then merely as prolonging Christ's utterances that the apostles had authority. The spirit of Christ was in them a fountain of

independent inspiration; so that inspiration was not, as Schleiermacher contends, an incommunicable property of Jesus, but shared by the apostles. The apostolic claim put at the head of the epistles, is thus tantamount to the direct utterance of Christ, as it is indeed thus translated by Paul, (in a sense how different from the recognition of any co-ordinate vote of Christian consciousness!) "If any man among you think himself to be *spiritual*, let him acknowledge that the things which I write are the commandments of the Lord." If epistolary inspiration was thus guaranteed to such a degree, that even an angel from heaven preaching another gospel was declared accursed, not less surely was the infallibility of the apostles secured, as writers of the gospel-history, by the promise that all things should be brought to their remembrance which Christ had said, words which, on Schleiermacher's theory of a natural reminiscence of divine communications, have absolutely no meaning. Thus the whole basis of apostolic authority is shifted away from the point where Schleiermacher placed it, to another where it ranks with that of Christ himself, and where, dissociated from a divine nature, or even pre-eminent endowments, it is placed on the same footing of a heavenly mission on which Christ himself put it: "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so I have sent them into the world." This *co-ordination* extends by the testimony of Christ himself not only to the apostles, but goes back to Moses and the prophets. No limitation of authentic Scripture can get rid of Christ's appeal to the authority of Moses, as testifying of Him, or his frequent quotations from the Old Testament, as a divine book. The repeated recognition of Moses as a prophet pre-eminently like Christ, cannot be impugned; and Schleiermacher himself has acknowledged that Second Epistle to Timothy, and employed it to impeach the first, in which it is affirmed by Paul with reference to the Old Testament, that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God."* Many more express passages and general principles from the New Testament might be adduced to corroborate those already cited. But these are sufficient to prove (leaving for the present Schleiermacher's unsettlement of the canon to the historical evidence which re-establishes it) that inspiration was not so bound and restricted to the life of Christ as to exist elsewhere only in gleams and shadows, requiring "Christian consciousness" to detect it; but that by the

showing of Christ himself, his own inspiration found its work in developing truths and doctrines which pre-existed by inspiration in the Old Testament, and was transmitted to the apostles with such clearness and authority as to leave Christian consciousness no other place but that of devout submission to whatever came from apostles in word or writing as revealed doctrine. The true place of Christian consciousness is thus, to take words for once out of the mouth of Strauss, expressed by the precept, "*Taceat mulier in ecclesia*;" and no claim can be set up for it, on the ground that as the Church preceded the Bible, it ought to have a voice in assenting to or rejecting it, for this is merely to say that the apostles preceded their writings, and their piety their inspiration—commonplaces which are rather an insecure foundation for a doctrine of universal inward light, to which the sources of Christian belief give no sanction.

The effect of Schleiermacher's views of inspiration is to this day abundantly apparent, not only in the less advanced school that have kept true to his traditions, and waged in his name violent opposition against the orthodox, but likewise in the more enlarged and independent thinkers, such as Nitzsch, Julius Müller, Twesten, and Tholuck, who with Neander at their head, and shortly before his death, united more openly than they had ever previously done under the banner of Schleiermacher's memory, virtually to resist the advances of that more strict supernaturalism which from various influences was gaining ground in Germany. These eminent men, indeed, have far exceeded Schleiermacher in their concessions to the older orthodoxy, and to a great extent have returned to those results in regard to the canon and the supreme authority of the apostolic Scripture which in the first revival of faith in Germany were regarded as extreme. With the exception, perhaps, of the Book of Revelation and the Second Epistle of Peter, they do not express much hesitation as to the right of any part of the New Testament to its place, and they yield to the Epistles all the reverence which is possible on the highest theory of inspiration. Almost no exception occurs to us as taken by them to any apostolic statement but that of the approaching end of the world, which they represent the apostles (we think on very unsatisfactory grounds) as unanimously leading their converts to expect. The masterly compend of apostolic doctrine given by Neander in the second volume of his "*History of the Planting of the Church*," is a great step beyond Schleiermacher; and no intelligent adherent of a

* The other interpretation of these words is considered afterwards.

more rigid theory of inspiration can quarrel with his exhibition of multiplicity in unity in the views of Paul, Peter, James and John, but will rather admire the profound Christian wisdom and truth with which points of apparent opposition are adjusted and harmonized. A similar change is very clearly reflected in Nitzsch's "System of Christian Doctrine." He admits that the absence of Christ was compensated by the presence of the Paraclete, and that revelation was thus transmitted in its original purity; that no one can receive the Word of God save through the apostolic writings; that appeal to any other authority, such as inward light, independently of these writings, is mere fanaticism; that the Church has not given the Scriptures any claim to authority, but receives all its own authority from them; and that the Church is based on the Scriptures—in other words, on the belief, that the same power of God to which we owe the revelation made in apostolic preaching, has been exerted to give us in the Scripture a unique, distinct, and perfect conveyance of that revelation. Nay, Dr. Nitzsch goes so far as to maintain, that the Church, even in Christ's own day, rested on *written* revelation, seeing that both He and his apostles appealed to the Old Testament; and that thus, to use his own words, there never was "an absolute interregnum of oral teaching."* It is obvious how widely these representations tend to depart from the ground of Schleiermacher, and to approach to the theology of the Reformation; yet in the same treatise there is a tendency both to elevate Christ's inspiration above that of the apostles, and by consequence to depress the latter nearer to the level of the ordinary working of the Spirit in the Church, which clearly betrays the influence of the school; just as if, in order to exalt the Saviour, it were necessary to make Him an *absolute starting-point in the history of true religion*, and in comparison of his direct utterances to depreciate all his indirect revelations both before and after his Incarnation.

The views of inspiration which lie at the basis of Neander's "Life of Jesus Christ" endure less satisfactorily a logical examination than those of almost any other work of this great and influential theological party. There is much both of depth and beauty in his construction of the evangelical history as a whole; and it did not need his acuteness and learning to expose at a thousand points the utter preposterousness of the mythical theory. Yet the result of his

treatise is in many respects unsatisfactory as a full reflection of biblical data, and even as an application of his own principles in his earlier work. He contemplates the gospels throughout as purely historical composition, partaking of no other inspiration than that radiated from their subject. He acknowledges in them no inconsiderable number of positive errors—for example, that Matthew puts a false sense upon the "sign of Jonas," and that John erroneously applied the words "destroy this temple," to the Saviour's resurrection. He concedes the point, that they have (especially John) sometimes put their own words into the mouth of Jesus, or (especially the synoptical evangelists) mixed up discourses altogether different, and out of their proper connexion. He extends their fallibility to arbitrary lengths—as, for example, that John might be mistaken in supposing that Judas was guilty of peculation; or Mark, in ascribing the death of the Baptist to the revenge of Herodias, and not as Josephus, to Herod's fear of insurrection. And he will allow nothing in their narrative for which he cannot find a guarantee in their natural capacities and opportunities of knowledge, maintaining that the disciples were too much agitated at the time of their Master's apprehension to give a perfectly accurate account of it, and that we have no evidence that the veil of the temple was rent at the crucifixion, unless it may be that some converted priests afterwards furnished the information. These and similar statements appear to us serious blemishes in an otherwise admirable performance, which must militate against its acceptance in this country as a final reply to the work of Strauss. It is indeed a far harder task to believe, with those who reject the supernatural character of Christianity, that the whole life of Jesus is a superstructure of fiction, raised upon the slenderest basis of commonplace reality, than with the German Church historian, that a divine life was left to be reflected in a series of stained and broken mirrors. Only as the one procedure must be protested against as gigantic error, the other may be dissented from as mutilated truth, and that all the more that it is not consistent with itself. What room is left, on this principle of historical fallibility, for the promised and admitted influence of the Holy Spirit? In Neander's pages the synoptical evangelists are throughout represented as following a system of one-sided, partial, and defective compilation—as unlike as possible to the style of men from whom the early Church, to say nothing of inspired critics still in the midst of it, expected, according to their

* These principles are, for brevity's sake, condensed from the fifth German edition, §§ 37–42.

Master's promise, and received their highest narratives of the highest of all transactions, which lay at the foundation of Christianity; and even John is thrown entirely upon the resources of his memory for his copious and often intricate reports of our Saviour's discourses, without having put to his credit a single help like that of Paul, "I have received of the Lord, that which also I delivered unto you." It must be set down as another and a great inconsequence, that Neander freely applies the harmonistic principle to the larger apparent discrepancies between the gospels, as, for example, respecting the seat of our Lord's ministry, and the scene of his appearances after the resurrection—the presence of parables in the other gospels, and their absence in John—our Lord's residence in Nazareth or Bethlehem—the resurrection of Lazarus, the agony in the garden, and many others, while the lesser discrepancies are abandoned as irreconcilable. The principle of repetition is admitted in the case of the Saviour's anointing, and even suggested in that of the entry into Jerusalem, while in the face of the most positive testimony it is denied in that of the miracle of the loaves. The principle of accommodation in our Saviour's allusions to Jewish opinions is discarded, and yet he is made to quote in the temple the 110th Psalm, as one in which David in spirit calls the Messiah Lord; though Neander thinks it probable that David did not write that psalm, and that the unknown writer of it, whatever the ultimate view of the Spirit, had no reference to the Messiah whatever. How much incoherences like these tend to impair the compact and logical form of the work in which they appear, is felt both in Germany and in this country; and if Neander complains, as he does in his preface, that his theology suffers from the principle, "*τὰ ἐν μεσῷ ἀμφοτέρωθεν κτείνεται*," it must, with all deference, be replied, that his own armoury supplies the javelins to both the opposite sides by which his *juste milieu* is attacked.

Without animadverting upon other works of adherents of this theory we shall confine ourselves to the last, and by much the most interesting of them all—one which may be regarded as a kind of confession of faith from this camp of partial inspiration. We refer to the essay of Dr. Tholuck in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*" for 1850. This publication was started in the beginning of 1850, a few months before Neander's death, and at his instance, in conjunction with Nitzsch and Müller, as a weekly organ of the theology and Church politics of the middle school, which needed some such counterpoise against

the sturdy energy and growing influence of that formidable Berlin journal, "*Hengstenberg's Kirchenzeitung*." Though greatly crippled by the lamented death of its founder this organ has taken a high place, and has called forth many valuable essays; though it may be remarked that it has too much ballast and too little sail for the widest kind of popularity. In this periodical Dr. Tholuck was called upon almost immediately to discuss the doctrine of inspiration; and his four papers, from April to November 1850, are mentioned at the head of this article. The two first are historical, and are intended to prove that the doctrine of strict or plenary inspiration, has not been held by the majority of Christian writers and churches from the beginning, but one more free and lax, admitting not only a human element, but the presence of error to some, though not to a serious extent in the sacred books. In this historical inquiry it appears to us that Dr. Tholuck has been eminently unsuccessful. He sets up the most rigid theory of inspiration ever broached—that prevalent in the 17th century, according to which not only the writers were entirely passive (*calami spiritus*), and the words dictated to them in one even stream, but likewise the Hebrew points and accents, and even the general punctuation, were declared to be immediately from God. He finds abundant evidence that *this* theory was neither held in the early Church, nor by the Reformers, nor sanctioned in any confession before the 17th century. But he totally fails in what ought to have been the great object of his review—to find, in any epoch of the Church, before the commencement of the rationalizing period that began with Grotius and Leclerc and continued throughout the 18th century, such plain admissions of error in the Bible as should serve for a breastwork to modern German evangelism. The utmost that Dr. Tholuck can make out like a precedent for this view, among the Fathers, is an acknowledgment of Origen, who is himself, however, admitted to have held the strictest theory of inspiration, that he could not on historical principles harmonize the gospel accounts of Christ's last paschal journey; and a statement of Chrysostom, who otherwise believed that all contradictions of the sacred writers were only apparent, that Paul in his speech before Agrippa was left to some extent to mingle the workings of his own mind with the supplies of grace—a statement perfectly consistent with the infallibility of Scripture. The only one of the schoolmen who roundly charges any of the sacred writers with error is Abelard, whose

authority, however, on a theological question, is of the lowest. The rash expressions of Luther must be admitted, balanced, however, by the strongest assertions elsewhere, that Scripture was immaculate. But the other Reformers, and especially Calvin, are quoted with injustice on the same side, for what they say amounts to this, (what every harmonist has repeated,) that there were chronological and other difficulties, which they could not perfectly remove. Calixtus, to whom Dr. Tholuck traces the origin of the laxer theory which at length prevailed in the Lutheran Church, in express terms admits the entire truth of the biblical records; as did Baxter, Doddridge, and other English divines, both of the Church and among Dissenters, whose names are singularly enough introduced with those of Socinus and the Arminians, as all conspiring to prove that the theory of infallibility has always been in the minority. Dr. Tholuck, then, who cannot be supposed to have brought forward the least effective witnesses, seems to us to have completely failed in establishing for his theory, anything at all approaching to an influential standing-ground in the general tradition of Christian doctrine.

Dr. Tholuck's other two papers are occupied more with the exegetical and dogmatical aspects of the question; and though they evince, perhaps, the nearest approach which is possible from this side to what we must still call the orthodox* theory, they are far enough from obviating the objections we have already advanced to the views of its earlier representatives. Dr. Tholuck undertakes in this part of his work to do three things—to test the strict inspiration theory by the structure of Scripture—to adduce biblical testimony for the laxer theory—and to turn aside the Scripture testimony unjustly alleged for the other view. This is certainly a fair and honest programme. We cannot pronounce that it has been carried into execution.

In considering the structure of Scripture, Dr. Tholuck acts hardly by his antagonists, among others Gaussen, whose theory we shall afterwards notice, in descanting on the peculiarities of style and the evidences of mental individuality in the sacred writers, for this has never been more eloquently illustrated than by Gaussen himself, and may be regarded as now universally admitted. It is more to the purpose, and this is the gist of the argument, when he asserts, that in the Old and New Testament there are “numerous proofs of inaccuracy in mat-

ters of fact;” and he charges the scrupulously orthodox with using such elaborate and forced devices to remove these, that at last Scripture in their hands has come to resemble a garment covered with innumerable pieces of patchwork, rather than a seamless coat. Dr. Tholuck knows well enough, and frankly confesses, that the opponents of Christianity have often spied a rent where there was none; but still thinks himself bound to concede that in not a few places the rent exists. We cannot within our limits follow him into detail: but having examined his proof-texts, and knowing something of what has been written regarding them, we take the liberty to adhere to our old opinion, that the same arguments by which Dr. Tholuck in his elaborate and valuable reply to Strauss, obviates his attack on the *larger* inconsistencies (so-called) of Scripture, avail also to the elimination of his own *minor* difficulties. Dr. Tholuck, beginning with misquotations of the Old Testament, according to the Septuagint version, thinks he has found three such in the Epistle to the Hebrews, where errors in the Septuagint are made the basis of reasoning.* We do not enter into the philological and other discussions connected with this question. In opposition even to the high authority of Dr. Tholuck, we regard all these citations as legitimate grounds of argument, the variations from the Hebrew being unessential to the proof, and agree with Calvin in his note on the last, though Dr. Tholuck inaccurately represents him as admitting a misapplication of this and the second of his examples:—“Neque enim in verbis recitandis adeo religiosi fuerunt, modo ne Scriptura in suum commodum falso abuterentur. Semper hoc spectandum est quorsum citent testimonia, nam in scopo ipso diligenter cavent ne Scripturam trahant in alienum sensum; sed tam in verbis, quam in aliis, quae presentis instituti non sunt, sibi liberius indulgent.”

Such inaccuracies of discourse, next alleged by Dr. Tholuck, as the different versions of the sermon on the Mount, by Matthew and Luke, we set aside by adhering to the old explanation of a double discourse, though there seems no contradiction between different reports of the same speech, if neither reporter professes to give the whole, nor in its absolutely identical connexion. The same principle applies to different applications of the same proverb, as of the blind leading the blind, or of a tree being known by its fruits, for surely this is a proof of mental fertility worthy of admira-

* See a former note.

* The passages are chaps. ii. 6, 12, 13; x. 5; xii. 26.

tion: and it is rather curious by the way, that Strauss argues against *that* repetition as the mark of an empty head, a departure from which Dr. Tholuck thinks fatal to the accuracy of a discourse.

Inaccuracies of fact Dr. Tholuck admits to be much exaggerated, and on the supposition that the sacred writers did not adhere to the order of time, unjustly charged upon them. He appeals, however, to some undoubted lapses of memory, as where Abiathar is put for Abimelech, (Mark ii. 26,) Jeremiah for Zechariah, (Matt. xxiii. 9-10,) Barachias for Jehoiada, (Matt. xxiii. 35, and where Paul makes 23,000 fall (1 Cor. x. 8) instead of 24,400. We must confess that we see nothing more forced in the explanations of these difficulties by the harmonists, than in Dr. Tholuck's own essays of the like kind, *e.g.*, the taxing under Cyrenius, or the double calling of the Apostles. It was in the days of Abiathar that the incident in David's life happened. Jehoiada might be the grandfather of Zacharias and Barachias his father.* Jeremiah may have crept in by a corruption of the text, and Paul may have given the number that fell approximately, there being more than 23,000 and less than 24,000. We do not, however, by any means hold it to be necessary to justify an honest belief in the infallibility of the Bible, that every such example as Dr. Tholuck has adduced should be summarily and convincingly explained. We freely acknowledge the difficulties in some cases which, notwithstanding all efforts of this kind, still exist. In books so extensive, so ancient, so liable to error in transcription, especially in the case of resembling names and numbers, the marvel to us is not that so many real difficulties exist, but so few, and that so many reasonable suppositions can be made in almost every case to effect harmony—suppositions precisely of the same kind which advocates of partial inspiration employ against those who reject supernatural revelation altogether, and which critics devoid of all Christian prejudices, apply to the chronology of Herodotus and Berosus, or the narratives of Tacitus and Josephus. The infallibility of the Bible rests on its own inductive evidence, and this evidence is not abolished by such discrepancies, though the number already fairly eliminated by honest criticism is continually re-inforcing it, as is also the marvellous verification, by all antiquarian research and progress, of the minute accuracy of Scripture where it once was questioned. We must deny, therefore,

the validity of Dr. Tholuck's procedure, when—after having gone a great length in removing discords—he at last stops and says, “here is unquestionable error.” We should rather leave these outstanding difficulties as problems for criticism and motives to fresh investigation, not shutting our minds to honest scruples, nor forcing others to swallow our premature solutions, but neither also refusing the strong historical testimony of Scripture to its own infallibility, nor doing it the injustice of shrinking from carrying through that infallibility in detail.

In examining these allegations of Scripture respecting itself, Dr. Tholuck betrays this weakest part of his own system. The *locus classicus*, “All Scripture is given by inspiration of God,” &c., he translates, as might be expected, “every writing that is inspired is also profitable,” and affirms that it was the design of Paul to give to Timothy a criterion of true and false Scripture, viz., the power of the former to make the man of God perfect. We do not assent to Dr. Tholuck's translation on philological grounds; but much less on logical, for it is not unnatural to make Paul write to Timothy in an age when every body was agreed about the Old Testament canon, as Schleiermacher might have lectured to his class, when setting up the inward criterion; and does not the same result after all come out as on the other principle of translation, for the reference to “the Holy Scriptures” in the preceding verse proves that Paul in speaking of *any* Scripture as inspired spoke of *all*, and meant to ascribe to all the same salutary effects. Dr. Tholuck next runs *sicco pede* over the weighty statement, Rom. xv. 4, “Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope,” on the ground that much of the Old Testament does not excite hope but terror; as if the Apostle meant to enumerate all the kinds of learning derivable from the Old Testament, or as if hope in God's faithfulness were not increased by examples of punishment as well as reward. We can least of all commend, however, his treatment of our Saviour's words, (John x. 35,) “The Scripture cannot be broken,” which he does not hesitate to regard as accommodation to Jewish notions of the rigid accuracy of the Old Testament, even as the argument from the use of the word “gods” (Ps. lxxxii. 6) is nothing more than an *argumentum ad hominem*. We are sorry to see any part of the accommodation-theory, long dead and buried, even by “critical science,” thus revisit the

* Even De Wette and Strauss are almost satisfied with some explanations of this difficult text.

glimpses of the moon; more sorry still that it should re-appear under the auspices of one who has done so much to give its *quietus* to the rationalism of Gabler and Paulus, of which that theory was a living member.

These passages are almost the only ones which Dr. Tholuck thinks it necessary to examine, as appearing to sanction the alleged claim by Scripture to its own infallibility. But these, strong as they are, represent in a very inadequate degree the whole strength of the case. Every assertion in the Old Testament or the New, in which occurs a "Thus saith the Lord," or an appeal to authority derived from Christ, not only guarantees itself, but affords a presumption that the writer in question was not allowed to mix his own errors with the truth of God. Every argumentative quotation by our Lord or his Apostles is a direct proof that the sacred writer quoted was regarded by them as on a level with themselves; and even the more ornamental quotations are made with tokens of respect, and in phrases of deference that amount to the same thing. The whole of our Saviour's ministry is a perpetual commentary on his own words, *Ἐπευῶτε τὰς γραφὰς*, and he even dies with them on his tongue. In the Epistles of Paul alone, upwards of 250 quotations, many of them argumentative and turning on the minute accuracy of the original, exist; and each of these speaks as plainly as it can for the uniform authority of the source whence it is taken. Evidence of this kind must be studied in detail; and any one who reads through the whole Bible, as we have lately done with the view of estimating the magnitude of its own claims, direct and indirect, for itself, may well be astonished at their number and variety, and must regard the specimens examined by Dr. Tholuck as only like the occasional highest peaks of a great mountain range, where everything asserts for itself an elevation above all ordinary levels. There is of course no later revelation to do honour to the New Testament as it does to the Old; but can any one believe that the Gospels, little as they claim in comparison for themselves, are not exalted by the very act of quotation that ratifies the histories of the kings of Israel, or that when Christ treated the Hagiographa as divine, he did not virtually promise an equal authority to the least obtrusive memorials of the new dispensation? Against this mass of historical evidence in the form of claims, direct and indirect, there is nothing to be set on the other side. The alleged disclaimers of Paul are two-edged weapons cutting the hands of

those who lay hold of them. Dr. Tholuck, for what reason we cannot tell, has concluded his Essay without giving his promised account of these disclaimers of infallibility by Scripture; but what others have written is liker an attempt to put them in the Bible than to extract them from it.

In parting company with Dr. Tholuck's essay, we must be permitted to say, though in opposition to his authority, that the case is very different between an immaculate Bible, bearing the weather-stains of time in various "readings," and one veined here and there with *original* flaws and imperfections. Not to speak of the different inference back to the author of the work in the two cases, there is in the former a constant approach to the original by critical appliances; while in the latter the absolutely true is never any nearer: and still more, not only does proved error work a greater unsettlement in the credibility of the Scripture, since we have not one sacred writer to check another, for every hundred manuscripts and other sources that we have to act as checks on corruption in each other, but the inconsistency of such errors with such high claims is far more painfully felt in the inspired scribes of the Bible than in the ordinary transcribers of their writings, and tends to shake more or less their entire authority. Many good men we know, and Dr. Tholuck among the best, have held their faith in the Bible unaffected by these credited errors; but they must ever be like a sting in the hearts of the great body of Christians, and when carried down to the multitude a Bible thus divided against itself becomes *felo de se* and cannot stand.

The discussion of the question of inspiration by Dr. Tholuck, in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*," called forth two protests to which we shall draw attention as elucidating the struggles of Continental Theology around this fundamental article of faith. The first protest came from Dr. Stier, a writer of great and growing influence, whose work on the "*Discourses of the Lord Jesus*," the title of which is prefixed to this paper, is perhaps the most important of all the contributions that have been made within the last decennium to German exegesis, and exhibits more wholesome results of the Straussian controversy, as well as a better antidote for its wounds than any other. In other writings, extending over a considerable part of the New Testament, he has endeavoured to carry out inductively a much stricter theory of inspiration than the middle school, and his books on the Psalms and on "*Isaiah not pseudo-Isaiah*," maintain reverential views of the

Old Testament with a tenacity and vigour to which they are strangers. He everywhere lifts his voice against the current German practice of separating Bible interpretation from practical uses, and condemns in no measured terms the over-drawn style of courteous discussion on the common ground of science between those who hold the Bible to be the word of God and those who hold it to be a string of myths and traditions. He is a man of conspicuous individuality and power, more like Bengel in most things than any living German theologian, whom it would be well if he could imitate too in point of brevity. His great aim in his principal work is to vindicate the gospels by an inductive proof of their divine coherence, and to illustrate the mystic depth of our Lord's words, as well as their unity in the different evangelists, by a detailed review of them as the central and light-giving essence of his life on earth. We think that he has in most things exhibited the divine and self-evidencing meaning of the Saviour's teaching and relative history, and thus made good his own exalted views of inspiration more successfully than any German defender of the gospels who has yet appeared; while we by no means assent to all his conclusions, which suffer here and there from a disposition, not sufficiently restrained, to find connexions and deep senses where they probably do not exist. He does not contend for the absolute impeccability of the sacred writers in dates and names, but he draws the line of their infallibility a great deal closer than it has yet been done in Germany, and speaks with a strength and confidence of their absolute and entire inspiration, abating here and there the barest externalities, which is new in that country. "If the Son did not know," he says, "the day of his own second advent, need we wonder that the Spirit left his evangelists in ignorance of much respecting the dates of his earthly history. But no man will ever prove that they have committed one positive and essential error even to a day or an hour." The whole Scriptures, Old and New, he regards as in the same sense divine that the Son of God is, and uses that comparison of the written to the Incarnate Word, which cannot be employed on any theory of partial inspiration. In the labours of such a writer we heartily rejoice, and regard him, and a school which he will no doubt create, as likely to do for the New Testament the same service on the principle of strict inspiration that Hengstenberg and others have done for the Old.

His protest against Dr. Tholuck's essay is somewhat intemperate in spirit, which is

to be regretted, and perhaps all the more that the latter had hit a weak place in Dr. Stier's theory—the incompatibility of his emphatic, vehement, and oft-repeated assertions of the authority of Scripture with any admission in it even of a minimum of error. We agree with the scope of his protest against the so called believing theology which Dr. Tholuck represents, as incapable of insisting with full earnestness on the surrender of human belief to the authority of God speaking in his word, but we also think he would improve his own logical position, and do no harm to his exegetical conscience, by casting away the last remnant of conformity to that middle system on whose waverings and fluctuations he has bestowed so much scornful eloquence.

The other protest which Dr. Tholuck's dissertation called forth was from Dr. Merle d'Aubigné of Geneva, who complained of an erroneous statement in it respecting the well-known breach caused by the retirement of M. Scherer from the Oratoire in that city in the end of 1849. This Dr. Tholuck had ascribed to a reaction against the extreme opinions of Dr. Gausson, whereas Dr. Merle d'Aubigné in his reply, contained in the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*" for December 1850, shows that Scherer had entered the Oratoire as a professor five years after the publication of Gausson's work, and two years after the issue of a work of his own, in which sundry differences from Gausson's opinions were openly expressed. Dr. Merle d'Aubigné and the Oratoire are entitled to the benefit of this explanation, as the misconception is still as current in this country as it was in Germany. In the same paper Dr. Merle d'Aubigné enters into a lengthened criticism of Scherer's views in order to vindicate the Geneva school in the matter of his dismissal, (or rather resignation,) and to secure for them against their late colleague the sympathies of German theologians; which naturally tended rather to the other side. This leads us to take some notice of M. Scherer's sentiments, which in a review like this could hardly be omitted, considering the interest they have excited in many quarters, though that interest is now dying away. We agree in substance with Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's estimate; but we prefer judging M. Scherer from his own words. His most important publication are his two letters, (*La Critique et la Foi*;) the former addressed to the directorate of the Oratoire in giving in his demission, and containing his creed on the subject of partial inspiration, with the reasons for his change from orthodoxy—the latter addressed to a friend, and attempting

to shew that the Gospel of Christ survives intact though plenary inspiration be abandoned. We shall only touch lightly on this part of our subject, both because M. Scherer's opinions are already tolerably familiar to the British public, and because, in fact, they add almost nothing to those of Schleiermacher, but may be regarded as a translation of the latter into French rhetoric, unmodified by those corrections and abatements which Schleiermacher's own great disciples had applied to his system.

We wish to do all justice to a sincere though, as we believe, erring brother, who writes as one who knows and loves the Divine Author of the Bible, and who, so far as we can see, has acted with praiseworthy honesty and manliness in expressing his sentiments and abiding the consequences. It is the more painful to find in his publication grave mis-statements of obvious facts, fatal inconsistencies in his own creed, and opinions broached which strike at the foundation of all distinctive authority in Scripture whatever. Is it not a grave mis-statement roundly to assert that no part of the New Testament claims inspiration—to confound things so diametrically opposite as submission to God speaking in his own Word, and speaking by a human representative who supersedes it—to lay on the shoulders of the unlettered Christian the whole burden of criticism ere he find his way to the Saviour, as if the orthodox theory did not proclaim to all the world the internal evidence of the Scriptures—and (though this is foreign to the main question) to charge the common theory of the atonement with making the Saviour “wrest pardon out of the hands of God?” (*Il ne l'arrache pas à Dieu comme le veut l'orthodoxe*, p. 39.) Then as for inconsistencies, can there be greater than to represent his own system as getting rid of history and criticism, when all the while he makes salvation still depend on the knowledge of the historical Christ, as he is revealed in the Scripture; or when he professes to believe in a Christ without the Bible, anon returns to the Bible as the only source of Christian experience, and again equalizes the inspiration of all Christians with that to which the Bible was due? May we not ask, if men are capable of judging of the alleged contradictions of the Sacred Writings who are thus blind to the real contradictions of their own? And notwithstanding these inconsistent admissions of the value and necessity of Scripture as the mirror of Christ's person and work, how destructive to its dignity such assertions as, that “every Christian ought to expect the same inspi-

ration in kind as the apostles”—that “to cease to expect inspiration is the fall of the Church”—that “the word of Christ is not yet exhausted by the apostolic doctrine”—and that, “instead of sending our proselytes to the leaves of some mysterious oracle, we must direct them to the great prophets of all time, and to the living instruction of the Church, and to the Word of God personified in his servants.”—(Pp. 16, 46, 22.) Such incoherences and extravagances as these justify us in regarding M. Scherer's system of inspiration as not so much a theory as a rhapsody. Christ is now all-in-all; then the Scripture which contains his image is all-in-all; and then the Holy Spirit in the Church is all-in-all without any attempt to harmonize jarring contrasts or settle conflicting pretensions. We therefore do not pursue this investigation farther; but may direct our readers, in addition to Dr. Merle d'Aubigné's strictures, to the acute and vigorous papers of the Count de Gasparin, translated by Mr. Montgomery, which contain some fuller accounts of Dr. Scherer's speculations as developed by himself in the “*Revue de Strasbourg*,” and exhibit at great length, and in a kindly spirit, the tendencies of his ill-assorted creed to increasing laxity and dissolution. It may be mentioned, that while the views of M. Scherer were not such as to awaken sympathy in this country or in the breast of French Protestantism, they have generally been regarded, even in Germany, as going too far; and in Geneva itself, where the sentiments of Tholuck and other German divines on Inspiration are represented in the national Church, M. Cellerier, one of their most distinguished professors, has expressly condemned M. Scherer's movement as fraught with Radicalism, and as tending only to overturn and to destroy.

To gather up the very latest utterances of French and German Protestantism on the subject of inspiration, we must refer to another controversy in which Count de Gasparin has been engaged. His antagonist on the occasion was Dr. Ullmann of Heidelberg, the well-known and accomplished editor of that first of German religious magazines, “*Studien und Kritiken*.” Dr. Ullmann published some years ago a little work entitled “*The Essence of Christianity*,” which was translated in 1849 into French by M. Sardinoux of Montauban, and was subjected to a most severe ordeal of criticism; having been designed for a public more accustomed than the French to speculation, and less liable to be startled by philosophical formulas as a part of the garniture of Christian ideas. In particular, Count de

Gasparin made it the subject of a lengthened review, in the end of 1851, in the same Journal, (the "Archives du Christianisme,") in which he had replied to M. Scherer; but it would appear (for we have not seen his article) in some respects with less success. Dr. Ullmann has discussed his objections in the third Number of his journal for 1852, with great candour, and we think has in most cases satisfactorily disposed of them. Count de Gasparin had brought against German evangelism the charge of mysticism, and had given certain criteria of its presence in religious systems. Dr. Ullmann, whose studies have lain much among the mystical writers of the middle ages, has had no difficulty in proving these tests inapplicable, and has vindicated the right of true mysticism, in other words, of spiritual depth and discernment, to a place in all Christian piety and Christian theology. This does not particularly concern us, however, and is only mentioned to bring in the reference of the debate to inspiration. Count de Gasparin had charged German theology, as a mystical theology, with setting up an inward feeling, in place of an outward rule. To this Dr. Ullmann replies, (and it is so far satisfactory to have his testimony as to the question of right, whatever becomes of that of fact,) "True mysticism, as the defender of faith and love, against a religion of abstract notions and outward precepts, is far removed from any desire to tear itself away from *revelation* as the objective basis, and from *Scripture* as the certain rule of Christian life; and when such mysticism lifts up its voice in behalf of pious feeling, this is not with a view to drive the Scripture into the back-ground, and bring forward the other as a religious authority, but simply because the truth of Scripture can only become, by the medium of feeling, our living possession, and because what is read must be felt in order to bring forth fruit," (p. 566.) Than this nothing can be more just; but in replying a little farther on to Count de Gasparin's charge against him, in common with other German theologians, of denying the *exclusive* authority of Scripture as an outward rule, Dr. Ullmann is far less satisfactory, and in truth, betrays the confusion and incompleteness of thinking of which he had been accused. He admits that the Bible is an outward rule, the turning-point of Protestantism, but denies that it is exclusive. His reasoning is curious in favour of some inward supplement. Christ is the centre of the Scripture, and higher than the Scripture, therefore Christ as *exhibited* in the Scripture is the rule of our faith. Why should it not be said rather, "Christ

speaking in the Scripture," according to the language of Peter, "Thou hast the *words* of eternal life?" But is not this *exhibition* of Christ an outward rule? "By no means," replies Dr. Ullmann, "the exhibition is made to faith, and faith is an inward principle," (p. 592.) "It is very true," we make answer, "but as faith is not creative, but receptive, you give up the question, else what do you make of your concession, that feeling cannot sunder itself from Scripture?" Dr. Ullmann descends to the strange evasion that *the gospel is not a law*, and that Christ has abolished the *legal* principle. What are we to conclude, then, respecting such phrases as "the *obedience* of faith," "the perfect *law* of liberty," or the solemn and terrible expressions of the Epistle to the Hebrews, as to the greater danger of those who rejected Christ speaking from Heaven, than of those who despised Moses' law? We do not yield to Dr. Ullmann in insisting on the necessity of inward illumination by God's grace as the condition of a right treatment of the outward rule, and on the impossibility of ever adapting our spiritual nature to it, save by the assimilation of faith. But this does not abolish the authority of Scripture, as a God-given law; the recognition of its authority is the first step to the attainment of the inward conformity which is aimed at; and onward to the end of the Christian life the perfection of faith is the perfection of submission. Here, alas, is the sore place in German theology, even the more advanced, and till God himself be pleased to heal it, both the smiting and the salving of human criticism must be in vain!

We have mentioned Coleridge as among the most influential of the advocates of a partial inspiration, and his sway over the minds of many has perhaps been as great as that of Schleiermacher. He has determined, however, no such advance towards good in his country's theology; and the effect of his errors (as we conceive them) on this subject, though far less errors than those of Schleiermacher, has been proportionately more injurious. We admire the genius of Coleridge, and love the man; but our assent to his philosophical and theological creed (within the common limits of Christian faith) is extremely qualified; and could we utter all our mind on these points, to admirers like Mr. Maurice and Archdeacon Hare, our observations might have too much of an iconoclastic character. We protest indeed against the literary outrage lately done to Coleridge by Mr. Carlyle, as only injurious to the hand that dealt the blow, and trust that our passing remarks shall breathe a just respect for one who

must ever hold a high place in British literature, and no mean place in Christian theology. We regret the error that struggled through life-long abortions to graft a higher style of Christian divinity on the intractable and mutually repellent philosophies of Kant and Schelling, and disfigured the simplicity of Bible truth with such disguises as *noumena* and *phenomena* and such cabalistic quineuxes as the "pentad of operative Christianity." In this Coleridge was unlike Schleiermacher. In too much else they coincide—the depreciation of external evidence—the exaltation of the Church as a judge of the word, in Schleiermacher more in the individual, in Coleridge more as hardened into the tradition of the mass—and to come to the point before us, in the refusal of assent to the unlimited infallibility of Scripture. Coleridge's sentiments and tendencies on this subject are found, as all the world knows, in his posthumous work, "Confessions of an Enquiring Spirit," in many respects a valuable book, as it certainly is a most poetical one, and one in which no intelligent advocate of plenary inspiration need refuse to admit, that there is much which may be studied with profit by all the adherents of that doctrine. The creed of this book is somewhat like the following. The divine influence to which we owe the Bible is of two kinds—(1.) *Inspired Revelation*, to which we owe the law and the prophets, "no jot or tittle of which can pass unfulfilled," and between which and all ordinary grace, "there is a positive difference of kind—a chasm, the pretended overleaping of which constitutes imposture or betrays insanity;" and (2.) *the highest degree of ordinary grace*, to which we owe the *Hagiographa*, different only in degree from the ordinary actuation of the Holy Spirit, (pp. 88, 89.) So much for the Old Testament.—How the New is to be parcelled out into these classes Coleridge has nowhere informed us. It is contended that the inspiring influence has not been such as to guard against errors in detail, which, however, are now reduced to the lowest minimum, "some half-score apparent discrepancies," "a petty breach or rat-hole in the wall of the Temple," (pp. 40, 42,) and again enlarged so as to make one liable to be silenced by the infidel "who throws in one's face the blessing of Deborah or the cursings of David, or the Grecisms and heavier difficulties in the biographical chapters of the Book of Daniel, or the hydrography and natural philosophy of the patriarchal ages," (p. 54.) Nevertheless, it is maintained that the essential and glorious truth of Scripture, as a whole, will force its own way, more es-

pecially if it be presented rather as the supply of the deepest wants of our souls, than as an authoritative literal message from God,—a remedy verified and authenticated by the Church, and thus insinuated by the voice of experience and love, rather than enjoined by external sanctions as absolutely infallible.

Such is the substance of Coleridge's own creed, as far as we can make it out, and it occurs to us to remark almost nothing in regard to it beyond what has been observed elsewhere, unless to complain of its silence regarding the New Testament, and to draw attention to the fact, that where errors in the Bible are once admitted the tendency is to widen the breach, as we see illustrated in Coleridge's own recital, and that too in a didactic treatise.

These oversights and slips may be due, however, to the vehemently polemical cast of Coleridge's style, which is here its characteristic feature. The book is rather an onset on the current dogmas of inspiration, than a calm and logical exposition of a new theory. It is certainly, in this respect, a sublime example of poetical passion and metaphorical oburgation, such as is perhaps unmatched in our literature. The hard charges brought against the dogmatists seem to resolve themselves into *three*. Of these we shall say a word in succession. *First*, There is the charge of *Bibliolatry*, in other words, of worshipping the letter of the Bible. This unfortunate term, coined in an evil hour, and since freely bandied about by scorners in whose eyes Coleridge himself would have been a Bibliolater, he only applies to the practice of overlooking all difference in the argumentative value of texts of Scripture, and running away with scraps and clauses of verses (merely because they are in the Bible) on which to build doctrines or establish moral conclusions; and he regards this as the inevitable tendency—the *reductio ad absurdum* of the scheme of plenary inspiration, because infallibility admits of no degrees. We condemn the practice in question as much as Coleridge or any other reprove can do; and on whomsoever the stroke alights let it fall. But the inference deduced to the disparagement of plenary inspiration is *invalid*. The mind of the Spirit is maintained by no orthodox theologian worth naming to be identical with all that is recorded in Scripture; and as great authorities among the orthodox have protested against the unduly literal or unduly figurative systems or accidents of interpretation as among laxer schools. The very book of Job, to which Coleridge appeals, is mentioned in many treatises on

plenary inspiration, as an example in much of its structure of the distinction between Scripture as a *record*, and Scripture as an *authority*; and indeed, the case is so plain, that we are almost ashamed to enlarge on it. His charge, except as against the weaker brethren of any Church, is the fruit of mere haste and forgetfulness. Why must the man who believes both letter and spirit to be from God, despise the spirit or neglect it? To use Coleridge's own figures, he has the kernel as well as the spiritualist, though the other may have the husk too, the sheaf as well as the straw-bands, and if he begin to worship the latter to the disparagement of the former, or to confound the one with the other, let him be duly reprehended, but let not the charge be flung at his head which strikes at the Bible itself as much as his abuse of it.

Again, there is the charge of *mechanism*, or denying all free spontaneous agency to the inspired writers. We believe that Coleridge is virtually the author of the much-repeated distinction between *mechanical* and *dynamical* inspiration, though these words are not used in his treatise. Many truly eloquent things are uttered by him against that construction of the Spirit's influence which suppresses all personality and conspiration of the inspired persons: and the passage respecting Deborah in particular, (pp. 31-36,) lauded by Tholuck, and admired by Stier, we freely subscribe to. Still we doubt, (nay, we are sure of the contrary,) if this fine writing be anything better than beating the air, in so far as the controversy between limited and plenary inspiration is concerned. It is not the *mode* of inspiration that is discussed: it is its *extent* and that alone. As to the mode of inspiration, there are difficulties which neither Coleridge nor any one else has solved or can solve. To explain a miracle is a hopeless problem. One may try his logic if he choose upon the conversion of water into wine. A dynamical theory would sound here as bald as a mechanical one. All colours are alike in the dark. And if the production of Scripture in the mass be a miracle, as Coleridge admits explicitly, at least in regard to the Law and the Prophets, and doubtless much besides, who shall pretend to track out its laws, or to make everything plain by a few such phrases as "personal individuality," "adaptation of native temperament," or "elevation of religious consciousness?" If Deborah was in her normal state she was not a prophetess, (at least *in actu*;) if she were out of it, who shall psychologically explore the difference? We do not deny the co-operation, or rather the sublime possession

of the sacred writers (*φερομένοι*;) with the inspiring influence: and we believe also that that influence adapted itself to the laws of their mental working, as we see in some abnormal states of mind higher types of its natural thought and imagery. But who that looks at the prophets rapt into scenes utterly new, and left in darkness as to the meaning of their own visions, while still the individuality is as perfect as in the barest chronicle, can shut his eyes to the mysteries of the question, or think that by the jingle of *mechanical* and *dynamical* he has abolished something tamely literal on the one hand, and established something profoundly spiritual on the other? If this polemic against mechanism has any meaning as applied to the extent of inspiration, as distinct from the mode, it seems to amount to this, that the sacred writers were dynamically inspired that they might occasionally err, in other words, ceased to be inspired at all where the dynamic element came in, so that the dynamic element was not strength but weakness. There must be a fall it seems to demonstrate freedom: and the sacred writers must command our sympathies by shewing that they are our erring brethren. Pure gold is too hard and unmanageable: the coinage of heaven cannot be worked up without its dross and alloy.

Thirdly, There is the charge of *sceptical consequences*. Coleridge contends with great amplitude and vehemence that the doctrine resting on no foundation of rational evidence, but on a weak fear of consequences should any error be once admitted in God's word, and on a superstitious craving for an external infallibility that might rival the papal, in fact draws after it, by its exaggerations, the very consequences it was meant to preclude, and strengthens scepticism within and without; leaving the Church to be disturbed by every suspicion, and the Bible to be overthrown by every proof of its internal discord and inaccuracy. Now, in reply to these allegations we at once deny the frequent charge, that the sources of belief in plenary inspiration are such *a priori* anticipations or such straits of controversy as is gratuitously supposed. The historical certainty that much of the Old Testament, as Coleridge himself admits, was directly written as an oracular communication—the promise of our Lord to his disciples to bring all his words, and surely also their connecting facts, to their remembrance by a Spirit equal in infallibility to Himself—the imperial and authoritative strain of the three greatest of Epistles, not to speak of repeated claims to an inappellable supremacy as of men who had the mind of Christ—the deferential quo-

tation of the Old Testament, as a whole, by both Christ and his apostles—together with reasonings founded on the Hagiographa and obscurer parts of the Old Testament, in which they are expressly spoken of as the work of the Holy Ghost—to say nothing of all-inclusive declarations of its divinity as it then existed—these, with many minor arguments and irresistible inferences to the less strongly guaranteed parts of the New Testament canon, form *a basis of positive evidence* to which Coleridge has given no weight, and which none of his school who still develop this theoretical origin of the doctrine they oppose, have fairly looked in the face. Coleridge, indeed, only once glances at the tributes by our Saviour and Paul to the Old Testament, as affording a plea for full inspiration, but scornfully sets these aside as no more pertinent than a general eulogy on Shakspeare would be to settle the authenticity of Titus Andronicus or the poetical merits of Henry VI. But he all the while forgets that the tributes in question are *not general but special*, exactly as if the depreciated works of Shakspeare had been quoted under his name, and declared to be full of his spirit. We repel, then, as singularly unjust the assumption that the doctrine in question is the mere progeny of fear and weakness, and not of reverence for the recorded declaration of the highest authority that Christians own. But does it truly plunge us in those consequences it was hypothetically invented to obviate? To us no inference seems less fair and conclusive. Even M. Scherer grants that had we a mass of contradictions and errors in Scripture which we could not shut our eyes to, still *positive assertions of its infallibility by a competent authority* should produce an antinomy, and leave the mind *in equilibrio*. It is a reckless exaggeration to maintain, as is sometimes done, that a single proved error in the Bible should utterly nullify the whole body of historical evidence that proves the miracle of its inspiration. That evidence could stand a harder strain than has ever yet been laid upon it, leaving the believer in plenary inspiration in doubt and perplexity indeed, but not in despair. It is not denied that earnest and honest minds, who have held this doctrine, have had their times of mental agitation. The man who has had none, or who speaks disdainfully of his fellows who have passed through this struggle, has our wonder rather than our sympathy. But should a few apparent errors make a mountain of evidence tremble in the balance? Difficulties, except to sceptical minds, do not produce scepticism, but only lead to a more thorough weighing of evidence

and exploration of light. And will any candid man say, that if the emergent, and as yet unsolved difficulties of Scripture, amount to no more than Coleridge's summation, "some half-score apparent discrepancies in the chronicles and memoirs of the Old and New Testament," they form a rational basis for scepticism, or warrant the renunciation of an otherwise proved doctrine? We have seen how slender an array the crucial instances of Dr. Tholuck exhibit, and no competent student of the Bible, not of a morbidly fault-finding temperament, can rate them very much higher. Without any unreasonable straining of faith, the necessary brevity of narration, the occupation of different points of view, the neglect of chronological details, and many other circumstances, may surely be supposed to have given a discordant aspect to some parts of Scripture from the beginning. Nor is it an evasion, but a perfectly honourable solution, to ascribe some considerable portion of the alleged phenomena to accidents of transcription. It should be borne in mind, too, how many once magnified difficulties (such as the post-Mosaic origin of alphabetic writing) have since vanished, and how other "breaches and ratholes" (we take words as they are given us) have been stopped up even to the satisfaction of those who apply most sternly the dark lantern of criticism to such apertures, and labour to enlarge them. The moral discords between the Old and New Testament spirit, to which Coleridge also alludes, do not seem more fairly to warrant the sceptical inference. The "curseings of David" are not more terrible than our Saviour's denunciation of the Pharisees; and one who does not find any difficulty in regarding the wrath of God revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness and ungodliness of men, as perfectly consistent with love, should not be greatly stumbled by that sublime impersonal hatred of evil and of evil men as evil, which breathes through the Psalms of David as the blast of heaven against the face of wickedness. We search in vain through the Old Testament for any approved severity which was not done in God's name; and if Coleridge believed Jael guilty of the odious perfidy he seems to impute to her, would not this be to make Deborah sing her own condemnation, and fall not only below the level of prophetic inspiration, but of vulgar humanity? We permit ourselves one remark more on this subject. If the spirit of the Old Testament was not purged by inspiring influence in its approved models and sanctioned monuments, why is the alleged defect limited to one field? Why is vindictive

wrath the only stumblingblock? Why have we no ode to chant the praises of domestic servitude, no hymn on the blessings of polygamy, no counter-epithalamium on the felicities of divorce? To us the marvellous freedom of the Old Testament from sanctioned moral discords with the New, is one of its most supernatural features, and reduces apparent exceptions to insignificance and shadow.

These are some of the guards by which a believer in this doctrine might honestly escape every sceptical pitfall. Nor is a single prudential rule which Coleridge has laid down for guidance in dealing with the honest sceptic inapplicable on the other side. The internal evidence of Christianity is here also—its glorious history—its incorporation with all truth and nobleness in the best periods of the world's leading nations. We can as fairly as he turn these objects first to the inquirer's eye, ere it meet the counterbalancing difficulties, though we care little for any arrangement that looks like concealment and reserve. These considerations for the sceptic all remain, nay, remain in far higher efficiency, for they crystallize around the Bible as their fixed centre. The echo in the Church leads back to the original voice. The brightness of the camp conducts in every line to the sacred Ark with its Volume over which the glory rests.

We shall not do Coleridge the injustice of confounding his mitigated expression of the defects of the Bible, with what has been heard from some members of his school. We shall not press him with the retort that applies with irresistible force to them. The separation of the truly divine from the human and imperfect element in the Bible has been represented as a most difficult and painful process—a process in which the learned chiefly can have a share—and one which affects and modifies many received conclusions respecting Bible authority. It would almost seem to be a principal part of the discipline of a Christian's life to construct out of the common text his critical edition; and this discipline is alleged to be assalutary in its own nature as secure in its results. Of this fraction (we hope it is nothing more) of the school of Coleridge, we will only say, that we neither envy them the blessedness of their trials, nor the safety of their attainments. The voyage to heaven is trying enough, with its shifting winds and treacherous tides, without adding (if clear evidence do not demand it) the presence of a leakage in the vessel, and the frequent sound of starting timbers. We deplore the struggles of an honest mind in this predicament—thoroughly honest and at the same time

thoroughly intelligent. The abatements it must make from the natural meaning of the Bible in speaking of itself—the total uncertainty where to draw the line between the essential and unessential elements of the compound—the incapacity of appeal to an inward criterion without exalting it above the admitted revelation—the helplessness of the guidance of the Church, which on this supposition is but a multiple of the same incapacities; all would seem to make this position one of prolonged disquietude, which could only be escaped by final scepticism, or by returning to an infallible Bible, or by rushing into the arms of an infallible Church. In the presence of the sceptic, especially, such a defender of Christianity would be sore pressed by the cross examination, "If you give up the Bible as a *regula regulans*, how is it to be printed as a *regula regulata*? Who is to issue your expurgated edition, and on what principle? Where are you to put in the brackets, the italics, the obelisks, like buoys and beacons of an unsafe navigation? Your lighthouse of the world is itself in error, not only by an aberration of the light but by a nutation of the luminary. What Bureau of Longitudes shall supply the ephemerides (*Höhere Kritik, Wissenschaftliche Kritik, Endresultate der Exegese*) to help the poor mariner to his haven?"

On the manifestations of British opinion subsequent to Coleridge favourable to partial inspiration, our limits forbid us here to enter. Our estimate of the theory of Arnold, as it is incidentally developed in his Sermons, may be easily gathered both in its light and shade from our previous criticism. Of Mr. Morell's system we shall only remark, that it is but an expansion of that of Schleiermacher, with this leading difference, that Schleiermacher's "religious consciousness," a modification of "feeling," is supplanted, not always, or indeed generally, in a constant manner, by Cousin's "intuition," a power of "reason." On the psychology of this system, which seems to us to err still farther in making logic conversant with the fragments of intuitions to which it is utterly blind as wholes, we shall not now animadvert. We protest chiefly against the fundamental fault of his work on the "Philosophy of Religion," in its bearing on inspiration, that it throughout abolishes an objective source and rule of subjective piety. We insist as strongly as Mr. Morell on the need of a supplementary influence to make the outward standard spiritually available; nor shall we quarrel greatly with any psychology that agitates the question by what inward powers, or by what combination of them, this spiritual

comprehension is made. But to lower and thrust into the background the objective side as springing up only secondarily, and as being affected by the imperfections of the subjective in "verbiage, memory, mere judgment, and logic," is what we regret to see done by a writer of his talents and sincere aims; and if our preceding reasoning be of any value, the doctrine of biblical infallibility thereby sustains great injustice. We regret also the inevitable tendency to equalize the intuitional consciousness in the historical Church with that from which the Bible on this theory first sprung, so that in regard to its interpretation we hear from Mr. Morell such echoes of the results of M. Scherer as these, that "we should not be always looking to the vestments of worn-out ideas, instead of interpreting the living voice of God as it speaks to us in the phenomena of the present hour."—(P. 351.) If this course be once taken everything is downward. Religion becomes an affair of universal suffrage. Dogmatic is merged in Statistics. And the eternal Alp of an infallible Bible, the same in sunshine as in storm, melts away in the haze of a *fata morgana*, reflected from below, and varying with the changes of the atmosphere. Far be it from us to make light of the adaptations of the Bible to our deepest reason, or of the consent of the Church, like the voice of many waters, amid all minor and jarring noises, to its cardinal principles. But Mr. Morell's language tends farther than this by a great deal, and looks like an unhappy relapse to the criterion of rationalism under a Christian name.

"This light and darkness in one chaos joined,
Who shall divide? The god within the mind."

Closing here our review of theories of partial inspiration, we are happy to think that an examination equally extensive of the varieties of the theory of plenary inspiration, as it has recently been held and asserted, is by no means called for. Minor differences appear in such standard works of a comparatively bye-gone period as those of Dick and Henderson, and in such essays, representative of the views of large sections of British Christianity, as those of Dr. Edie, Dr. Harris and Dr. Candlish. The spirit, however, is the same; and it is satisfactory to observe a growing purpose to treat as indifferent the psychological niceties of the question—such as modes and degrees of inspiration, and the inspiration of the words, which we may truly say is, in more senses than one, as distinguished from that of the thoughts and sentiments, a *verbal* contro-

versy—and to rally around the one capital article of the INFALLIBILITY of the Bible.

With peculiar gratification, considering the quarter whence it comes, and the traces it bears of the school of Coleridge, do we welcome the truly learned, vigorous, and genial work of Mr. Westcott of Cambridge, on the "*Elements of the Gospel Harmony*." Such a reaction in favour of a plenary inspiration, intelligent and thoughtful, firmly held yet charitably pleaded for, is to us one of the most satisfactory signs that could be given from any English school of theology. Mr. Westcott's book is thoroughly informed with all recent German literature, and contains independent views on the gospels, and researches into patristic opinion. It stands on much the same parallel as Dr. Stier's work already noticed, (admitting, however, no minimum even of proved inaccuracy in the evangelic records,) and, with many of the merits, it has perhaps some of the imperfections of its German analogue, such as occasional fancifulness, and straining after hidden senses and well-balanced *schemata*. We sincerely regret that our limits prevent us justifying these remarks by examples. We cannot omit to notice the elaborate catena of the views of the fathers on inspiration, given by Mr. Westcott, which may be read as a corrective to the summary of Dr. Tholuck, and also the evidence from the pseudo-Clementine remains that our Scripture canon did not spring up in mist and darkness, but under the eye of a negative school as wakeful and active as the Ebionites of the present day. The whole style of Mr. Westcott's work shows how possible it is to think profoundly and reasonably without undermining the foundations of faith, and to be a debtor to Germany without being a slave.

The eloquent work of M. Gaussen of the Oratoire is, however, the most elaborate contribution that has been made of recent years to the literature of the orthodox side at home or abroad. With much in it we heartily accord, and cannot too much admire the fervour, brilliancy, and indomitable vitality by which it is distinguished. No one has more powerfully illustrated the individuality of the sacred writers, or urged more successfully the arguments from the language of our Lord and his Apostles, or obviated more convincingly the objection from various readings, and from the apparent unimportance of Scripture details. We cannot admit, however, the force of the reasoning that would exalt all the writings of the old and New Testament to prophetic dignity. We cannot limit the inspiration of the Apostles to their writings, for the

mistakes in conduct usually quoted to prove this, were, as Tertullian remarks, "*conversationalis vitia non predicationis*." And still less can we sympathize with the rigid uniformity with which he carries out, in little harmony as it seems to us with his own views of individuality, the theory of an *ab initio* dictation in the case of every sacred writer without exception. We regret this narrowing of the standing-ground which the believers in an immaculate Bible might occupy against all disturbing theories, and greatly prefer, as an ampler programme of united action, the homely conversational criticism passed by an unnamed colleague of M. Gaussen, on this part of his work, as quoted by Dr. Merle d'Aubigné in the letter already noticed to the "*Deutsche Zeitschrift*." "The Holy Spirit has treated the sacred writers as a father his child when they are climbing a mountain together. There are steep places, where he gives him his hand, others more dangerous, where he takes him up in his arms; and sometimes there are places more level, where he lets him run alone. In every case he gives him the help which the circumstances require."

We must repeat, in closing this article, our profound conviction of the present value of the propositions we have sought to discuss and defend. Three powers are now in active contest for the mastery of the world—ROMANISM, NATURALISM, and EVANGELISM; and it is our assured belief, that if Evangelism does not everywhere become and rejoice to be known as BIBLICISM—thus availing itself of a position which we believe reason can fully justify by evidence—it must suffer in the collision.

The headless arrows of an arbitrary and sentimental pietism will hardly avail against the formidable onset of the dogmatic infallibility of Romanism. There is an axe in the Roman fasces, and these pointless darts run no small risk of being added to the sheaf. Extremes will continue to meet as they have met already; and those who have refused to yield unconditionally to God will end by submitting to a *human* yoke. There is, indeed, a subtle affinity between one human arbitration and another; and he who has found a rule in himself above the Bible, has little to change in finding it (in *practice* if not in *theory*) in a sacred corporation. It is then a comparative accident whether the magnetic current shall prove of a negative or positive kind; and the only influence which can break the circuit is the introduction of a new element—a faith distinct from either self-reliance or blind creature-worship—in the absolute Word of God.

So is it too in the struggle of Evangelism with Naturalism. We invite all who are undecided to re-examine the evidence for the infallibility of the Bible, *as a matter of fact*, convinced that assurance here will bar, as it surely ought to do, those unwise concessions to the so-called spirit of the age, which are inconsistent with the idea of a fixed revelation. The mission of the Bible is to conquer the age and not to yield to it—to ally with itself indeed all truth and all progress, but to impress on all its own sublime identity. What can the Bible suffer, if its friends are only true to it? With what new weapons can it be attacked? With what green withes can it be bound? What has the enlightenment of the nineteenth century done to supersede it more than that of the fourth or the eighteenth? Every age has more than one Erostratus; but while they are quarrelling for pre-eminence, the temple stands, and their torches expire. Strauss abolishes Paulus: and Ewald declares that in Strauss there is absolutely nothing new. The giants, sprung from the dragon-teeth of scepticism, slay each other, while the Bible, like the immortal letters of Cadmus, (which are indeed its own,) passes on to mingle with the thought and speech of all lands and all centuries.

One might have hoped that by this time antagonism to such a book should have ended, a book that alights everywhere with healing in its wings, that has dissolved the worst fetters of humanity, marked the line for ages between liberty and despotism, as it seems almost about to do in our own between civilisation and reviving barbarism, and has so gathered up in itself all the rudiments of the future, and the seeds of advancement, that its eclipse would be the return of chaos, and its extinction the epitaph of history. The resistance of ages to this book, however, is, after all, its crowning legitimization. The Bible is too good for the race it has come to bless. It blesses them like an angel whose mission is peremptory, and it troubles too many waters in its work of healing to be left in peace. It is felt and feared by all the rulers of the darkness of this world. It is the visible battle-field of invisible forces, shewing in the radiant faces of the martyrs that have died for it, and the unearthly struggles of those who have hunted it from the earth, what mysterious interests are suspended on its safety or its destruction. No feeble suffrage can augment the claims of a book which has its witness below as signal as its witness above, which numbers, to say nothing of nobler trophies, its hundred millions of copies in circulation, and is going forth to the ends of the earth conquering

and to conquer. But to vindicate its majesty against all doubters as made in the image of God, with everything of humanity except its weakness, all its parts and lineaments shining with the lustre of the divince face, here more veiled, there more open, and an unction descending on it from the head to the skirts of the garments,—this is an office as grateful to Faith as it is welcome to Reason. It is an altar which sanctifies the meanest gift. And the worshipper may well be lost amid the myriads whose brightest hope, after walking by this oracle through life's darkness, is to reach that sanctuary of peace, where reverence for the Highest is wounded by no discord, and where those who have been the last to believe shall be the first to adore.

ART. VI.—1. *Travels through the Gold and Diamond District of Brazil.* By JOHN MAWE. London, 1812.

2. *Traité de Minéralogie.* Par M. l'Abbé HAUY. Tom. iv. pp. 419-440. Paris, 1822.

3. *A Treatise on Diamonds and Precious Stones, including their History, Natural and Commercial; to which is added the Methods of Cutting and Polishing.* By JOHN MAWE. Second Edition. London, 1823.

4. *Description of the Diamond Mine of Panna.* By FRANCIS HAMILTON, M.D., F.R.S., and F.A.S., Lond. and Edin. In *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, vol. i. p. 49. Edin. 1819.

5. *Notice respecting a Singular Structure in the Diamond.* By DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., and Sec. R.S.E. In *Edinburgh Philosophical Journal*, vol. iii. p. 98. Edin. 1820.

6. *On the Diamond Mines of Southern India.* By H. M. VOYSEY, Esq. In *Asiatic Researches*, vol. xv. p. 120. 1826.

7. *Account of the Diamond Workings and Diamonds of Sumbulpore.* By PETER BRETON, Esq. In the *Transactions of the Medical and Physical Society of Calcutta*, 1826. Vol. ii. p. 261.

8. *Notice of the Diamond and Gold Mines of the Residency of the North-West Coast of Borneo, in the Singapore Chronicle*, October 11, 1827, and in *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, vol. ix. p. 123, 1828.

9. *Voyage dans le District des Diamans, et sur le littoral de Brésil.* Par M. AUGUSTE DE ST. HILAIRE. Paris, 1833.

10. *Observations relative to the Structure and*

Origin of the Diamond. By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., &c. In the *Transactions of the Geological Society*, Second Series, vol. iii. p. 455. London, 1835.

11. *A Treatise on Gems in reference to their Practical and Scientific Value; a Useful Guide for the Jeweller, Amateur Artist, Lapidary, Mineralogist, and Chemist; accompanied by a description of the Most Interesting American Gems and Ornamental and Architectural Materials.* By DR. LEWIS FEUCHTWANGER, Member of the New York Lyceum, &c. New York, 1838.

12. *A Memoir on the Diamond, including its Economical and Political History.* By JOHN MURRAY, F.S.A., F.L.S., F.G.S. Second Edition. London, 1839.

13. *Catalogue of the Collection of Pearls and Precious Stones formed by the late Philip Hope, Esq.* Systematically arranged and described. By B. HERTZ. Folio, 42 Plates. London, 1839. Printed for private circulation.

14. *On the Optical Properties of Muriate of Soda, Fluuate of Lime, and the Diamond, as exhibited in their Action on Polarized Light.* By DAVID BREWSTER, LL.D., F.R.S., Lond. and Edin. In the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, vol. viii. p. 157. Edinburgh, 1816. Reprinted in the *Journal de Physique*, vol. lxxxiii. p. 81. Paris, 1816.

15. *On a Remarkable Property of the Diamond.* By SIR DAVID BREWSTER, D.C.L., F.R.S., and V.P.R.S.E. In *Philosophical Transactions*, 1841, p. 41.

16. *Travels in the Interior of Brazil, principally through the Northern Provinces and the Gold and Diamond Districts, during the Years 1836-1841.* By GEORGE GARDNER, F.L.S., Superintendent of the Royal Gardens of Ceylon. London, 1852. 8vo.

THERE is perhaps no department of general knowledge about which ordinary readers are less informed than that which relates to the diamond. Even the mineralogist, the chemist, and the natural philosopher have limited themselves to a very partial study of the origin, the history, and the properties of this remarkable substance. Ranked as it must be among the bodies of the mineral world, and regarded as it has ever been as the most valuable production which the earth embosoms, it has always occupied, from its value as well as its beauty, the first place among those precious stones which it is the highest ambition of wealth and power to accumulate. But though thus associated with zircon, sapphire, ruby, topaz, and the

emerald, it essentially differs from them all in its origin, its composition, and its physical properties; and while it takes precedence of them all, it is nevertheless the meanest in its elements, the weakest in its structure, and the most perishable in its nature. The full-grown diamond indeed exceeds in value more than a hundred thousand times its mass in gold:—It is the most cherished property and the proudest ornament of kings:—It is the most prized and the brightest jewel in the chaplet of beauty, and yet it is but a lump of coal, which it reduces to a cinder, and dissipates into that insalubrious gas which ascends from the most putrid marsh, and bubbles from the filthiest quagmire.

The word *diamond* is derived, through the French *diamant*, from the Greek word *Adamas*, *invincible*, and this again from *a* and *daṃaw*, to crush or subdue,—from its supposed property of resisting the action of fire and the heaviest strokes of the hammer.† The diamond seems to have been known from the remotest antiquity; and though it has not yet been found among the ruins of Nineveh and Khorsabad, we have no doubt that it will yet be discovered among the interesting relics of the Assyrian kings. The diamond is more than once mentioned in Scripture, but we have no means of ascertaining with accuracy that the original Hebrew words are rightly rendered in our translation. With the exception of the sapphire, the other gems mentioned in the Old Testament do not correspond with those which now bear the same names. In the breastplate of judgment worn by the high-priest, the second row of precious stones consisted of the emerald, the sapphire, and the diamond; and as the *Urim* and *Thummim*, which signify *lights* and *perfections*, were “to be as Aaron’s heart when he goeth in before the Lord,” it has been conjectured that “they were diamonds of great beauty and splendour.” The Prophet Jeremiah states that the sin of Judah was written with a *pen of iron*, and with the *point of a diamond*; and Ezekiel, in a mysterious passage, speaks metaphorically of the diamond and other precious stones as having been in the Garden of Eden. The Syrians are said to have carried on a trade in diamonds with eastern nations; and dia-

monds from the interior of Africa were procured from Etruria by the merchants of Carthage. Although, in speaking of the treasures at the time of the Trojan war, Homer does not enumerate any of the gems, yet it is certain that it was well known to the ancients. The Duke of Bedford possesses a diamond on which an antique head is engraven; and in the British Museum there is an ancient Roman gold ring with an octohedral diamond set in it.

In his work on Natural History, Pliny has devoted a whole chapter to the description of the diamond and its properties. He describes it as disseminated like gold in metallic veins—as accompanying gold, and as produced only in that metal. He says that the Ancients believed that it was found only in the metals of Ethiopia, between the Temple of Mercury and the Island of Meroë, and that it was never found larger than the seed of the cucumber, which it resembled in colour. Pliny then informs us that there were *six* kinds of diamonds,—the *Indian* diamond, the *Arabian*, the *Macedonian*, the *Cyprian*, a fifth called *Cenchron*, and the sixth called *Siderites*. The Indian diamond was not the product of gold, but had a relation to crystals. It was translucent like them, and it was hexangular, terminating in two opposite points, as if two rounded cones were joined together.* The size of this diamond was that of the kernel of a filbert. Similar to the Indian diamond, but much less, is the Arabian, which has the paleness of silver, and is found only in the finest gold. He describes it as of the most extraordinary hardness, breaking anvils and hammers, and resisting fire and heat. The Macedonian diamond which is also found in gold, (*Philippico auro*,) has the size of a cucumber’s seed. The Cyprian, so called from being found in Cyprus, verges into the colour of brass, and is most efficacious in medicine! The variety called Cenchron, is of the size of a millet seed; and the Siderites, which has the lustre of iron, exceeds all the rest in weight, and is dissimilar in its nature, for it is easily broken, and may be perforated by another diamond. Fragments of these stones, adds Pliny, are sought after by engravers, and when fixed in an iron handle they cut and excavate the very hardest stones. When Pliny assures us that the hardest diamonds can be macerated in the fresh blood of a he-goat,—that a magnet ceases to attract iron when in contact with a diamond;—that the diamond is an antidote to poisons,

* Maximum in rebus humanis, non solum inter gemmas, pretium habet adamas, diu non nisi regibus et iis admodum paucis cognitus.—Plin. *Hist., Nat.*, lib. xxxvii. cap. 15.

† Incudibus hiprehenduntur, ita respuentes ictum, ut ferrum utrinque dissulset, incudes etiam ipsae dissiliant. Quippe duritia inenarrabilis est simulque ignium victrix natura, et nunquam incalescens. Unde et nomen *indomita* vis Græce interpretatione accept.—Plin. *Id. Id.*

* Duo turbines—thus describing pretty accurately the octohedron with rounded faces, which is the most common form of the diamond.

expels watery accumulations, and drives away from the mind vain fears, we obtain an insight into the low state of physics, chemistry, and medicine, at the time when he wrote. Pliny concludes his chapter with the interesting statement that Metrodorus Scepsius avers that diamonds are found in Germany and in the Island of Basilia, along with amber.

It would be a vain and unprofitable task to trace the history of the diamond during the centuries of intellectual darkness which followed the destruction of the Roman Empire. The diamond and other precious stones, pre-eminent in value above all natural bodies,—above even the gold and silver idols of human worship, were regarded if not as spiritual creations, at least as bodies with which spiritual influences were associated. The magical touch of the aristocratic gem, like the royal manipulation of more modern times, was an infallible specific in diseases which resisted the ordinary skill of the physician. It reconciled the parties in domestic feuds—it tested conjugal fidelity, and when the stone itself was worn as an amulet, it controlled the deadliest poisons—calmed the raving madman, arrested the magic wand of the enchanter,—paralyzed the witch's evil eye, and chased from the shades of night the restless spirits that hover round the couch of mortality. These precious qualities, which wealth alone could purchase for itself, and dole out to suffering humanity, were not likely to be dissociated from the crystals which possessed them, even when science had proclaimed the real character and properties of mineral bodies. It is difficult, under any circumstances, to dislodge error from the seat which it has long occupied, but more difficult still when it has been interwoven with our interests and our fears. To find relief from pain, to add a fresh lustrum to declining life, to steal a glance into the future, and to obtain an interdict against his spiritual enemies, suffering and trembling man will grasp even the shadow of what may be truth, and relinquish it only when it has repeatedly deceived him. Even in the beginning of the seventeenth century, in 1609, when Boetius de Boot published his treatise "on Stones and Gems," and corrected the errors, and denounced the absurdities of preceding writers, he does not scruple to assert that though the superstitious and metaphysical properties which were ascribed to the diamond do not reside in the gem itself, they nevertheless belong to the angelic spirits which it has pleased the Almighty to connect in a mysterious manner with certain substances in nature.

Although the art of cutting and polishing diamonds had been known at an early period in India and China, yet it was only by means of emery or the powder of corundum, and a rude apparatus, that these effects were obtained. European jewellers had striven in vain to overcome the extreme hardness of the diamond, and it was not till 1745 that Lewis Van Berquen, a native of Bruges, conceived the idea of cutting and polishing diamond with its own powder. In rubbing one diamond against another he found that a facet was formed on each, and he was thus led to construct a polishing wheel, upon which, by using diamond powder in place of emery, he could grind and polish diamonds with the greatest facility.

Diamonds have now been found in every quarter of the globe. In Asia, Africa, North and South America, and even in Europe. In India they have been found of a large size, and in greater quantities, and it is accordingly from that part of the world that we received the earliest and the best information respecting this remarkable mineral.

The traveller to whom we owe the earliest as well as the most interesting account of the Diamond Mines of India, and of the diamonds which have been obtained from them, is Monsieur Tavernier, who performed six journeys to India chiefly on foot. As a diamond merchant every facility was given him to obtain the information which he desired, and the native princes allowed him to examine, and even to weigh the diamonds and other precious stones which they had accumulated. He was thus enabled to visit all the Four Diamond Mines then known in Hindostan, and also one of the rivers where the diamonds are found. The first mine which he visited was that of Raolconda, about eight or nine days' journey from Visapour, and five from Golconda, which was discovered about the middle of the fifteenth century.*

"Round about the place where the diamonds are found, the ground is sandy, full of rocks, much resembling the parts near *Fontainebleau*. There are in the rocks several veins, some half a finger, some a whole finger, wide: And the miners make use of irons with hooks at the end, with which they pick out the earth or sand, which they put into tubs, and among that earth they find the diamonds. But because these

* *Les Six Voyages de Jean Baptiste Tavernier, Ecuyer, Baron d'Aubonne, qu'il a fait en Turquie, en Perse, et aux Indes pendant l'espace de quarante ans.* Paris. 1751. 3 tom. Our extracts are chiefly from the English Translation, by Phillips. Lond. Folio. 1778. But our principal facts are taken from the original French, which contains much curious matter omitted by the Translator.

veins do not run always straight, but sometimes down, sometimes upward, the miners are constrained to break the rock, following always the trace of the veins: when they have opened all the veins, and taken out all the sand, then they wash it two or three times over to look for the diamonds. In this mine it is that they find the cleanest stones, and of the whitest water. But the mischief is, that to fetch the sand out of the rock, they are forced to strike such terrible blows with a great iron-lever, that they flay the diamond, and make it look like crystal: which is the reason there are found so many soft stones in this diamond-mine, though they make a great shew. If the stone be clean, they only give it a turn or two upon the wheel, not caring to shape it for fear of losing the weight. If there be any flaws, or any points, or any black or red specks in it, they cut all the stone into fossets; or if there be only a little flaw, they work it under the ridge of one of the fossets, to hide the defect. Now because a merchant desires rather to have a black speck than a red one, 'tis but burning the stone, and the speck becomes black. This trick at length I understood so well, that when I saw any stones in them that come from the mine made into fossets, especially very small ones, I was certain there was either some speck or some flaw in the stone."—*Tavernier*, p. 134.

At the mine of Raolconda there were several diamond cutters, who had each a steel mill, some of them like those used in Europe. "They cast water continually on the mill, to find out the grain of the stone," and when this is found they pour an oil (with abundance of powder of diamonds) to make the stone slide the faster, and in grinding a diamond which weighed 103 carats when cut, they laid on a weight of 150 pounds of lead.

The purchasers of diamonds paid two per cent. to the king on all that they bought. The miners, who know all the places where the diamonds grow, generally set 50 or 100 men to work, in a space about 200 paces in compass, and for the privilege of working this once they pay to the king two pagodas a day, and four when they employ a hundred men. When a workman meets with a stone of fourteen or sixteen carats, he carries it to the master of the works, who rewards him with a piece of calicut to make a bonnet, of the value of 25 sous, together with a half or a whole pagoda. When large diamonds are found, they are brought every morning at ten o'clock to the merchants, with whom they are allowed to remain for seven or eight days, when the price is agreed upon, and a bill granted for it upon Agra, Visapour, or Surat. When the diamonds are small they are disposed of in another way, which *Tavernier* thus describes:—

"'Tis very pleasant to see the young children

of the merchants and other people of the country, from the age of ten to fifteen or sixteen years, who seat themselves upon a tree that lies in the void place of the town: Every one of them has his diamond-weights in a little bag hanging at one side, on the other his purse, with five or six hundred pagods in gold in it. There they sit, expecting when any person will come to sell them some diamonds. If any person brings them a stone, they put into the hands of the eldest boy among them, who is as it were their chief; who looks upon it, and after that gives it to him that is next him; by which means it goes from hand to hand, till it return to him again, none of the rest speaking one word. After that he demands the price, to buy it if possible; but if he buy it too dear, 'tis upon his own account. In the evening the children compute what they have laid out; then they look upon their stones, and separate them according to their water, their weight, and clearness. Then they bring them to the great merchants, who have generally great parcels to match: and the profit is divided among the children equally; only the chief among them has a fourth in the hundred more than the rest. As young as they are, they so well understand the price of stones, that if one of them have bought any purchase, and is willing to lose half in the hundred, the other shall give him his money. They shall hardly bring you a parcel of stones, above a dozen, wherein there is not some flaw or other defect."—*Tavernier*, p. 135.

The following account of the "mystery" in which the Indians, whether Mahometans or Hindoos, "drive their bargains" with the diamond merchants, is given by *Tavernier* as something exceedingly curious. The sale is made in absolute silence, and without the least "talking on either side."

"The buyer and the seller sit one before another like two tailors, and the one of the two opening his girdle, the seller takes the right hand of the purchaser, and covers his own hand and that with his girdle; under which, in the presence of many merchants that meet together in the same hall, the bargain is secretly driven without the knowledge of any person. For then the purchaser nor seller speak neither with their mouth nor eyes, but only with the hand, as thus: When the seller takes the purchaser by the whole hand, that signifies a thousand; and as often as he squeezes it, he means so many thousands pagods or rupees, according to the money in question. If he takes but half to the knuckle of the middle-finger, that's as much as to say fifty. The small end of the finger to the first knuckle signifies ten. When he grasps five fingers, it signifies five hundred; if but one finger, one hundred."—*Tavernier*, p. 136.

The mine of *Gani* or *Couleur*, seven days' journey west of Golconda, was next visited by *Tavernier*. It stands near a great town, between which and a mountain is a plain, where they find diamonds. The nearer they

dig to the mountain, the larger are the stones which they find; but none are found at the top. This mine was discovered about the middle of the 16th century by a man, who, in digging a piece of ground to sow millet, discovered a diamond of 25 carats. The news spread like wildfire, and the "moneyed men in the town set themselves to work," and found diamonds larger and in greater quantity than in any other mine. Among the largest was the celebrated diamond of nine hundred Rattees,* or 793 carats, which belonged to the King of Golconda, and which his General Mirgimola presented to the Great Mogul. This diamond, known by the name of the Koh-i-noor, or Mountain of Light, passed through various hands, and after many changes in weight and in form, is believed to be represented by the Great Exhibition Diamond, belonging to her Majesty, and now weighing about 100 carats.

Although the stones in this mine are remarkable for their size, yet they are less clear than those of other mines, their *water*, or lustre, partaking of the quality of the earth in which they are found. When the ground is marshy, the colour of the stone inclines to black, and when red to redness. In other places they are green, and in some yellow, but what seems very curious, "upon the most part of these stones, after they are cut, *there appears a kind of greasy moisture*, which must be as often wiped off." In order to discover the water of these stones, they examine them with a lamp in the dark; but the most infallible process, according to Tavernier, is "to carry the stone to a tree thick of boughs," in order "to discern by the verdure of that shade, whether the water be bluish or no." Above 60,000 persons were employed in this mine.

The most ancient of all the diamond mines in India is that of Soumelpour, a large town, near which is the river Gouet, a tributary of the Ganges, in the sands of which the diamonds are found. In February, when the floods in the river have subsided, about 8000 persons flock from the town, and search for the diamonds in the sands of the river. The sand sometimes rises above the water, but when it does not, they drain off the water, and carry away the sand to another place, where it is washed, sifted, and examined.

About twenty or thirty years after Tavernier travelled in India, the Earl Marshal of England, who had visited several of

the diamond mines on the coast of Coromandel, communicated an account of them to the Royal Society. Although mines of diamonds occur everywhere in the great range of hills which commence at Cape Comorin, and extend about fifty miles in breadth through the whole of Bengal, yet very few of them are worked, and it was chiefly from the kingdoms of Golconda and Visapour that the world was supplied with diamonds, before they were found in America. The Earl Marshal describes no fewer than *twenty-three* diamond mines in the kingdom of Golconda, and *fifteen* in the kingdom of Visapour. In one of these, called Currure, which is said to be the finest as well as the most ancient, and which is worked by the king for his own private use, diamonds weighing *eight ounces troy*, or 81½ pagodas, or 960 carats, are said to have been found. About the beginning of the 17th century, when the country was under the government of the Hindoos, and when strangers were permitted to dig, a Portuguese gentleman went for this purpose from Goa, and having spent in mines a great sum of money, "he sold everything he brought with him that would fetch any money, even to the wearing clothes he could spare. While the miners were at work for the last day's expense, he had prepared a cup of poison, resolving, if that night he found nothing, to drink his last with the conclusion of his money; but in the evening the workmen brought him a very fine and great stone, of twenty pagodas weight, (206 carats,) in commemoration whereof he caused a great stone to be erected in the place, with an inscription engraven on it, in the Hindoo or Tellinga tongue, to the following effect, which remains to be seen to this day.

'Your wife and children sell, sell what you have,
Spare not your clothes, nay, make yourself a slave,
But money get, then to CURRURE make haste,
There search the mines, a prize you'll find at last.'

After which he immediately returned with his stone to Goa."

The mine of Wootoor, which is near Currure, yields stones of equal magnitude, and of similar shapes and waters, and, what is singular, the diamonds are found in *black earth*. The mine of Muddemurg is celebrated for producing diamonds of a fine shape and water; and Melwillie, or the

* The translator says 900 carats, but this is a mistake, as will be afterwards seen.

* Phil. Trans., No. cxxxvi. June 25th, 1677 Vol. xi. pp. 909, 910.

new mine, discovered in 1670, gives well-shaped stones of a very considerable size. The earth in which they are found is very red; and many of the stones found there have it sticking to them, *as if it had clung there, while they were of a soft glutinous substance, and had not obtained their hardness.*

The mines of Visapour yield stones as large as those of Golconda, though it is celebrated for its small stones, which yield a higher profit than the large ones. The diamonds are found in red and sometimes yellow earth, in all the fifteen mines of Visapour, and they are frequently enclosed in clods. The earth is carried to a sort of tank, with walls about two feet high and six feet wide, made of rugged stones joined together by mortar made of earth and water. This rude enclosure is strengthened outside by a bank, and is floored with stones. The earth from the mines is soaked in this tank, the clods broken, and the great stones picked out. It is then stirred with shovels till the water is muddy, and when the gravelly stuff has fallen to the bottom, and all the earth washed away, by using fresh water, and running it off, the gravel is spread out and dried, and the diamonds which it contains discovered, and picked out by their reflecting the light of the sun. The diamonds thus found are sometimes secreted by the workmen. Tavernier states that they often swallow the diamonds when they discover a valuable one; and a merchant pointed out to him one of his workmen who had concealed one in the corner of his eye. In Golconda, where all stones under a pagoda weight were given to the miner, and all above it reserved for the king, this arrangement was often violated by the overseer of the mines, and when the workmen found a stone approaching in weight to a pagoda, "they conceal it till they have an opportunity, and then with wife and children run all away into the Visapour country, where they are secure."

The diamond mines of India have been more recently visited by Dr. Hamilton Buchanan, Dr. Voysey, and others, and we are enabled, by their descriptions, to give a more accurate account of the matrix of the diamond, or rather of the nature of the rocks of soil in which it is found. Dr. Buchanan visited the diamond mine of Panna in 1813. Round Panna is a table-land of great extent, from 500 to 1200 feet of perpendicular height above the level of the Gangetic plain. The whole plain in the table-land, for several miles round Panna, in all directions, is said to produce diamonds wherever it happens to be of a gravelly nature. The soil is very red

in general, though in some places only slightly so, and is occasionally of a dark brown colour. The soil is from two to eight cubits deep where the diamonds are found, and contains many small pebbles a good deal resembling some ores of iron that Dr. Buchanan saw in Bhagalpur. The diamonds are found intermixed with this, but they never adhere to any stone or pebble. They are obtained, as usual, by washing away the earth from the gravel; and they are generally very small, usually worth only 500 rupees, though sometimes they are valued between 500 and 1000. The Ra'ah had one worth 50,000 rupees, which he placed in the head of an image. The workmen are allowed *three-fourths* of the value of stones the size of a pea, or smaller; *two-thirds* of the value of those about the size of a hazel-nut; and *one-half* of those larger than a filbert. Every person that chooses may dig; and the average number of diggers is about a thousand. The rock immediately under the gravel and earth, among which the diamonds are found, is a white granular quartz, too hard to be cut for building, stained red in many places, and containing more *black spots*, or dots, than usual. The workmen assured Dr. Buchanan "*that the generation of diamonds is always going forward, and that they have just as much chance of success in searching earth which has been fourteen or fifteen years unexamined, as in digging what has never been disturbed; and, in fact, he says, I saw them digging up earth which had evidently been before examined, as it was lying in irregular heaps, as thrown out after examination.*"

The late Mr. H. Voysey, who visited some of the principal diamond mines of Southern India, in January 1821, has thrown some light upon the matrix of the diamond. In the rock mines of Banganpalli the matrix of the diamond is a sandstone breccia, which is found under a compact sandstone rock, like that of the rest of the range. "It is composed of a beautiful mixture of red and yellow jasper, quartz, chalcedony, and hornstone of various colours, cemented together by a quartz paste. It passes into a pudding-stone, composed of rounded pebbles of quartz, hornstone, &c. &c., cemented by an argillo-calcareous earth, of a loose friable texture, in which the diamonds are most frequently found." For many years previous to Mr. Voysey's visit to these mines, no fresh excavations in the breccia had been made, and he therefore could not ascertain the mode in which the miners got at the breccia; but he saw many holes about five feet in depth, under large blocks of sandstone, where he was told the diamond bed

was found. Mr. Voysey confirms the statement of Dr. Buchanan, that the diamonds are supposed to grow in the old rubbish that had been previously examined. Nay, the truth of this opinion may be considered as demonstrated by the fact, that the miners no longer quarry fresh breccia from beneath the sandstone, but "*are content with sifting and examining the old rubbish of the mines, and in which they actually find diamonds.*" The opinion that diamonds grow in the previously washed, sifted, and examined rubbish, and that *the chips and small pieces rejected by former searchers actually increase in size, and in process of time become large diamonds*, prevails everywhere in India; and even at Gani Partaal or Couleur, where the Great Koh-i-noor was found, the search is confined to the rubbish of the old mines. Dr. Voysey draws the following conclusions from his examination of the diamond strata in India.

1. That the matrix of the diamonds produced in Southern India, is the sandstone breccia of the slaty slate formation.

2. That those found in alluvial soil are produced from the debris of the above rock, and have been brought thither by some torrent or deluge, which could alone have transported such large masses and pebbles from the parent rock, and that no modern or traditional inundation has reached to such an extent.

3. That the diamonds found at present in the beds of the rivers are washed down by the annual rains.*

In speaking of the probability of the opinion that the diamond is continually growing, Dr. Voysey makes the important observation, that in hot climates crystallization goes on with wonderful rapidity, and that he hopes, at some future period, *to produce undeniable proofs of the recrystallization of amethyst, zeolite, and feldspar in alluvial soil.* Unfortunately for science Mr. Voysey who was geologist to the Indian Trigonometrical Survey, died soon after his paper was printed.*

An account of the diamond workings and diamonds of Sumbhulpore was published about twenty-five years ago by Mr. Breton of Calcutta. The valley of Sumbhulpore,

about 410 feet above the level of the sea, and the streams at the mouths of which the diamonds are found, lie between the 83d and 84th degree of East Longitude and the 21st and 22d of North Latitude. Diamonds of various sizes, and of the first quality, are found at the mouths of the rivers Maund, Keloo, Eeb, and others, which rise in the mountainous parts of Koorba, Sirgoojah, Raeghur, Jushpoor, and Gangpoor, and fall into the Mahanuddee on its left bank. They are also obtained after the rains among the mud and sand deposited on the beds of islands upon the left bank, but never upon the right bank of the Mahanuddee, nor upon its left bank above its confluence with the Maund at Chanderpore, or below Soanpore. About 500 persons are annually employed from November till the rainy season, in searching the bed of the Mahanuddee for diamonds, wherever alluvial matter is deposited in its hollows, or where the current is obstructed by rocks. The earth, dug out by a pickaxe, is placed on a large concave board, with two raised rims, and the diamonds are found among the gravel which is left, by washing away the earth with water along the inclined board. The earth consists of a mixture of stiff reddish clay, pebbles, a small proportion of sand, and a little oxide of iron. At Sumbhulpore a diamond of the first quality is called Brahmin, of the second Chetree, of the third Bysh, and of the fourth Soudra, the four tribes of the Hindoos. A diamond of 308 grains or 77 carats in weight was obtained in 1807 by the Raneer Ruttun Coher, and in 1809 one of the Bysh quality, and weighing 672 grains, or 168 carats, was picked up at a place called Herakode, in the bed of the Mahanuddee. The diamond was not delivered to the Raneer, on account of her being occupied in the funeral rites of her husband's mother; and before they were finished the Mahratta troops arrived and expelled her from her territory. The existence of the valuable diamond was told to the commanding officer, Chunderjee Bhoon-sla, who persuaded the finder to surrender it for a fine village and 1000 rupees. No sooner was the diamond in the possession of the Mahratta chief, than he reproached the finder for bringing a stone instead of a diamond, and drove him from his presence.

The diamond mines of Borneo were known in the time of Tavernier, who was dissuaded from going to that island, because *The Queen* would not permit a stranger to carry off any of the diamonds, the few that were exported being taken away by stealth, and sold at Batavia. The diamonds are found in the sand of a river called Succadan.

* It may be useful to those who study this curious subject, to know that Mr. Voysey has misapprehended the theory of Sir David Brewster, of the origin of the diamond, when he gives it as the opinion of that author, "that the matrix of the diamond is neither a rock of igneous origin, nor one of aqueous deposition," whereas he merely stated, "that the compressible state of the diamond could not arise from the action of heat," and "could not exist in a mass formed by aqueous deposition."—*Edin. Phil. Journ.*, vol. iii. p. 100.

"I say the Queen," adds Tavernier, "and not the King, because in that island the women have the sovereign command and not the men. For the people are so anxious to have a lawful heir upon the throne, that the husband not being certain that the children he has by his wife are his own, but the wife being always certain that the children which she bears are hers, they rather choose to be governed by a woman, to whom they give the title of Queen; her husband being only her husband, and having no power but what she permits him."

A more recent account of the diamond mines of Borneo was published in the Singapore Chronicle of October 11, 1827. The mines in the residency of the north-west coast of the Island are worked by the Daya, the Malayu, and the Chinese. The earthy gravel called *Areng*, in which the diamonds are found, is obtained by sinking a shaft on the areng, about two feet in diameter, to enable the miner to turn round in it. The areng is from one to three feet thick, and is dug out to the extent of seven or eight feet from the sides of the shaft under the superincumbent strata, which are sometimes propped up. When the areng in the first mine is exhausted, and the course of the vein ascertained, a new shaft is opened in that direction, at the distance of fifteen or sixteen feet from the former one, to enable the miner when he reaches the areng to work back to the former mine, the same process being repeated till the vein is exhausted. The areng is hoisted up in small baskets, and then placed in conical circular trays, which are immersed in the nearest stream, and the areng washed by hand till the earthy particles are separated from it. The trays are then brought to the surface and whirled round, till the water they contain is poured off quite pure from all earthy matter. The Malayu use the same process; but the Chinese employ a more efficient one. The Chinese avail themselves of the shafts sunk and abandoned by the Daya or Malayu. Having formed a tank, or dammed up a small stream, a channel is cut in the direction of the vein, and the upper strata are entirely cleared away by the action of the stream of water. The areng is then dug out and washed in wooden troughs, fixed on an inclined plane. The largest diamond known with certainty to have been found in these mines weighed only *thirty-six* carats. The Sultan of Mattan is said to possess one weighing *three hundred and sixty-seven carats*, which he was afraid to cut lest it turn out to be flawed; but as the author of the article from which we quote informs us, "gentlemen to whom it has been

lately shewn consider it not to be a true stone."

At one time all diamonds under *four* carats were the property of the miners; but all of that size and upwards were claimed by the Panambachan, then a tributary of Bantam, from the Sultan of which state the former Dutch Company purchased this monopoly or royalty for 50,000 dollars. By a treaty with the Panambachan made in 1823, all the diamonds must be delivered to government at 20 per cent. below the market price, ascertained by appraisement on the spot, the necessary advances having been previously made to the miners. The small diamonds are sold at Pontianak, and the large ones disposed of at Batavia, and the profits divided between the government and the Panambachan. About 300 carats were found in the latter half of 1823, and 1900 carats in 1824. The quantity found in 1825 and 1826 was less than in 1824.

In his journals,* as published by Captain Mundy and Captain Keppel, Sir James Brooke speaks of his diamond works at Santah, where Palingi Ali assured him he and four men had in one day obtained *sixty* diamonds, some of them of four carats. He mentions his establishment there as consisting of two Banjar diamond workers and six labourers, to whom he added four Chinese for the diamond trench, presided over by Hajji Ibrahim, a Chinese Mahomedan, but he does not say that a single diamond has been found. The diamonds occur in a gravelly stratum, which is laid bare "after the Chinese fashion of trenching the grounds with a run of water through the trench." "The earth is washed at the water's edge in large round wooden pans shaped like shields; and when the diamonds are picked out there remains a residue of black sand like gunpowder, and gold particles."

The fullest and most interesting account of the diamond mines of Borneo has been given by Mr. Hugh Low, Colonial Secretary at Labuh-an†. The diamonds of Borneo, equal to any from India or Brazil in beauty, are found in the greatest quantity in Sango, Landak, and Banjarmassin, where they are worked to a small extent by the Chinese and Malays. Ever since the Malays settled in Borneo, the mines of Landak supplied them with diamonds. The mines of Sango and Banjar have been more recently explored. The principal, and indeed the only mart formerly opened for the Borneo dia-

* *Narrative of Events in Borneo and Celebes*, vol. i. p. 280. 2d Edition. Keppel's Expedition to Borneo in the *Dido*, vol. i. p. 293.

† *Sarawak, its Inhabitants and Productions*, by Hugh Low, pp. 26-29. London, 1848.

monds, was Batavia, and Sir Stamford Raffles says, that "few courts of Europe could perhaps boast of a more brilliant display of diamonds, than in the prosperous days of the Dutch was exhibited by the ladies of Batavia." The Borneo diamonds are found in a gravelly stratum, at various depths below the surface. The mines at Sarawak were formerly worked, but not very extensively. The gravel in which they occur is in some places not more than six feet, and in others as much as eighteen below the surface. They are generally small in size, but of the most brilliant water. Mr. Low saw a person get three small ones at one washing, together with a considerable portion of gold; and Sir James Brooke states that, previous to his time, "eleven men had, in three days, obtained a quantity of diamonds, which sold at Sandos (at half their value) for 5000 Java rupees." The great diamond of the Sultan of Mattan, which, as we have already stated, is erroneously supposed not to be a real stone, is, according to Mr. Low, still uncut, and if cut and polished, would be reduced from 367 to 183½ carats, that is, to one half its present size. Its present shape is that of an egg indented on one side. Its value, he says, is stated by Mr. Crawford to be £269,378, being less by £34,822 than that of the Russian diamond, and £119,773 more than that of the Pitt diamond. Mr. Low adds the important statement, that he has been informed "by a person who supposes himself to be a good judge of diamonds, *that the Sultan possesses the real stone,*" (and therefore not a false one as stated in the Singapore Chronicle,) *which he had seen;* but that a crystal is shown to strangers, as the Sultan who has been already robbed of his territory fears that this last emblem of royalty will be also taken from him by his powerful and avaricious neighbours. The Malays of Banjarmassin and Landak have offered to work Sir James Brooke's mines at Sarawak, but their characters are so bad that he does not encourage their immigration. We trust, however, that active means will be taken to explore the valuable treasures in that interesting locality, and that we shall soon be able to announce the arrival of valuable diamonds from a British Colony.*

The discovery of diamonds in Brazil early in the present century, has doubtless led to the abandonment of many of the diamond mines in India. In the mountainous district of Serro do Frio, which is

peculiarly celebrated for its diamonds, they are found in rivers or rivulets, in the banks adjoining water courses, and in ravines. The soil with which the diamonds are invariably found intermixed, is called *cascalhao*, which is a stratum of rounded pebbles and gravel, immediately incumbent on the primitive granite, inclining to gneiss, and covered with a stratum of *vegetable* earthy matter of variable thickness. Above the vegetable earth is a stratum called *burgalhao*, which consists of angular quartz pebbles, and not unfrequently large beds of solid quartz not more than four or five inches thick. The stratum, according to Mr. Mawe, does not seem to have been formed at the same time, or by the same means as the *cascalhao*. In the granite beneath the *cascalhao* there is a portion of hornblende and frequently mica. The soil is rich and remarkably ferruginous. In one part of the diamond district of Brazil the *cascalhao* forms a solid conglomerate or breccia of rounded pebbles, cemented by ferruginous matter, and in which the diamonds and gold are frequently enveloped. This pudding-stone is believed by Mr. Mawe to be of very recent formation. In order to obtain the diamonds from the *cascalhao*, the gravelly matter is freed from its adhering earths by the processes which we have already described. Mr. Mawe has given a drawing and description of the diamond workings at Mandango, on the river Fiquitnhoha in the Serro do Frio, where a thousand negroes are employed. The bed of the river is laid dry by an aqueduct, and the water is pumped from the deep pools left in the channel, by means of chain pumps worked by water-wheels. In former times the *cascalhao* obtained from these pools was carried to the washings by negroes, but it is now conveyed along inclined planes. When a negro finds a diamond of the weight of an 8vo (17½ carats) the event is celebrated with much ceremony. Crowned with a garland of flowers he is carried in procession to the manager of the washings, who presents him with his freedom, by paying his owner for it. He receives also a present of new clothes, and is permitted to work the mines on his own account. When a stone of 8 or 10 carats is found, the negro receives two new shirts, a complete suit of new clothes, and a handsome knife. For smaller stones of but little value proportionate premiums are given. The diamonds in the treasury of the king amounted in all to about 4000 or 5000 carats, the largest being a fine octohedral one of 17 carats. Diamonds, however, of a much larger size have been found, and one in particular in the alluvium

* Since this was written, we have learned that the Eastern Archipelago Company have obtained from the Sultan of Borneo the right of working all the mineral productions of his territory.

of the river Abaethé, of form approximating to the octohedron, and weighing *seven-eighths* of an oz. troy, or 105 carats, which Mr. Mawe, in his *Travels*, from some mistake, says, "is perhaps the largest in the world." In his later work he does not repeat this statement. He says, "that no potentate is so rich in diamonds as the king of Portugal, whose suite, which he had the honour of being shown, he estimated at more than *two millions sterling*." This fine diamond was discovered under very peculiar circumstances. It was found about the year 1797 by three convicts, who were banished into the interior of Brazil, and who when thus driven from society were anxious to obtain a remission of their punishment by the discovery of some new mine or production which the sovereign would value. Influenced by this motive, they wandered for six years through the most unfrequented parts of the country, exposed at one time to the violence of the Anthropophagi, and at another to be seized by the soldiers of the government. As the last resource they explored the bed of the river Abaethé when its waters had been greatly diminished by a long continued drought, and while they were washing its gravel and expecting only gold, they discovered the fine diamond we have mentioned. Uncertain how to act they consulted a clergyman who took them to the governor of Villa Rica, who, as soon as he ascertained that the stone was a real diamond, suspended the sentence of the convicts as a reward for its delivery. The precious gem was sent immediately to Rio Janeiro. A frigate was despatched with it to Lisbon, and the clergyman was also sent to make a proper representation of the case to the Portuguese Government. The sovereign sanctioned the pardon granted by the governor, and Church preferment was given to the clergyman.

The diamond mines of Brazil are stated to have produced only £40,000 per annum. Between 1801 and 1806 the expense of working them (wages being about 6d. or 8d. per day) seems to have amounted to £204,000, while the diamonds obtained weighed 115,675 carats, the cost per carat being £1, 13s. 9d. In ordinary years the return of diamonds is only about 20,000 carats.*

* "In the diamond district of Minas Geraes and St. Paul in Brazil examined by Claussen, plutonic forces acting upon dioritic veins have developed in one place common mica, in another ferruginous mica, in the quartzose *itacolumite*. The diamonds of Grammagoa are contained in layers of solid silicic acid. Occasionally they lie enveloped by plates of mica, exactly like the garnets formed in mica slate. The Russian diamonds found in 1829, in the European declivity of the Ural, also stand in geological relation to the black

Although the diamond district of Minas Geraes, so interesting from its mineral productions, has been visited since the time of Mr. Mawe, by MM. Martius and St. Hilaire, as botanists, and also by M. D'Eschwege, when geology was yet in its infancy, yet it was left to M. Claussen,* who resided twenty years in the country, to survey it with the care which it merits, and particularly in relation to the true matrix of the diamond and the euclase and topaz. The soil which yields diamonds, and has been long known in Brazil, extends into the provinces of Minas and St. Paul, from the 16th to the 26th degree of south latitude. When the diamonds disappear in this last latitude, in the province of St. Paul, the bituminous schists commence, which contain the coal in the province of St. Catherine. In the north of the province of Minas, the red sandstone is covered by a calcareous formation, equivalent to the Jurassic group, and which is itself covered with the gypsum marls with rock salt. In all the parts of this last formation, where the valleys have excavated sufficiently deep to shew the red sandstone, diamonds are found in the rivers—in the Rio Acary and others.

Early in 1839 diamonds were discovered in the psammite sandstone of the Serro do Santo Antonio de Grammagoa. This mountain consists of large beds of sandstone, which have occasionally the aspect of Itacolumite, but the strata having little inclination, and reposing immediately upon the macignos, (a transition formation,) leave no doubt of their identity with the Psammite sandstones of Abaethé. The first discoverers of these rocks, owing to their being soft, obtained many diamonds from them, but at a greater depth they became harder and more difficult to work. More than 2000 persons rushed to this spot, and working without any plan, they caused a part of the

carboniferous dolomite of Adolfskoi, as well as to augitic porphyry, which have not yet been made the subject of sufficiently accurate observations."—*Humboldt's Cosmos*, p. 283. Sir Roderick Murchison and M. Verneuil do not concur in the opinion that the diamonds of Chrestovodvisgensk have had their origin in the black dolomite of that place, for although this rock contains carbon, the alluvia in which the diamonds are found, though overlying the dolomite, have no carbon. They agree rather with Colonel Helmersen that the diamonds like the gold shingle, and the greater part of the accompanying detritus have been drifted from the adjacent flank of the higher mountains, in which micaceous quartz rocks exist, fragments of these (*itacolumite* or *micaschist*) being also found in the alluvium. See *Geology of Russia*, vol. i. p. 482, note.

* *Notes Géologiques sur la Province de Minas Geraes au Brésil*. Par P. Claussen, de L'Institut Brésilien, 1841. Published in the *Bulletins de L'Académie des Sciences et des Belles Lettres de Bruxelles*, 1841, Tom. viii., part i., pp. 322-343, with four plates.

mountain to fall, and by crushing the debris, they found many diamonds. Specimens of the rock with the included diamonds are not very rare. The diamonds are embedded in the Psammite sandstone, and in the Itacolumite sandstone, and sometimes between plates of mica, like the garnets in mica-schist. In the museum of Rio Janeiro there is a large rounded diamond, which has *very distinct impressions of grains of sand*. M. Claussen mentions a specimen of Pseudomorphous sandstone, two inches long and one wide, containing a diamond of nearly two grains, and crystallized in a rounded octohedron,* and also another specimen, the size of the first, of a yellowish sandstone, containing two diamonds, one of which weighs nearly a carat or four grains, and the other one grain. Both of them are crystallized in the perfect primitive octohedron; and M. Claussen has been assured that all the diamonds found in the Itacolumite sandstone are rounded octohedrons, while those found in the Psammite sandstone are perfect octohedrons. M. Claussen has given his views respecting the matrix of the diamond in the following interesting passage:—

“As I had already sent to the museum in Paris in 1838 specimens of red sandstone, as the presumed matrix of the diamond, I shall now explain the reasons which led me to this supposition, and which more recent discoveries have fully confirmed. In studying this subject for many years, I had remarked that the pebbles which are always found in the diamond-bearing *cascalhaos* were—1. Itacolumite (quartzose mica slate); 2. A sandstone, which I then took for a variety of Itacolumite; and, 3. some fragments of jasper; and I found that all other minerals in the *cascalhao* were quite accidental. I therefore believed that Itacolumite was the matrix of the diamond; but was not able to explain the cause of the total absence of the diamond in all the places where this rock was greatly developed. In a journey which I made in 1836 on the left bank of the Rio San Francisco, I visited the diamond bearing district of Abaethé, and on examining the *cascalhaos* of that river I found it composed nearly thus:—

Pebbles and angular pieces of maginons and petrosiliceous phyllades,	4 eighths.
Psammite sandstone and jasper,	2 “
Itacolumite sandstone,	1 “
Quartzose sand, with some grains of menakanite, peridot, garnets, &c.	1 “

“The presence of such a large quantity of maginons is not surprising, because the bed of the river is hollowed out in this formation, which prevails also in the environs to a great distance. What struck me more was the presence of a considerable quantity of pebbles of Itacolumite sandstone, which I then took for

true Itacolumite or quartzose mica-schist, which I knew only *in situ*, at a distance of 50 leagues from this. I then began to think that the magigno formation might rest upon the Itacolumite, and that this ought to exist and be found somewhere in the deep ravines which the waters had excavated in the transition formation. In spite of my researches I found only the latter. I began then to ascend the mountains; and my surprise was great to find deposited here and there on the terraces which skirted them, pebbles and pieces of Itacolumite, of sandstone and of jasper, &c. At last upon the top I found beds of Psammite sandstone resting on the transition formation, with which they have a conformable stratification, and into which they pass gradually. These sandstones contain sometimes veins of jasper, and of jasper agate, and in the same beds they sometimes suddenly change their aspect and structure, and assume those of true Itacolumite, I then instantly recognised the origin of these pebbles, which I had considered as essential to the *cascalhaos*, and I was forced to admit the existence of a secondary Itacolumite posterior to the transition formation, and therefore supposed it to be the primitive matrix of the diamond, which is now confirmed. . . . The diamond is never found enveloped in an earthy crust, as has been stated. Its surface is sometimes rough, but generally smooth. The diamond is easily recognised by putting it into water, for it there preserves its lustre, having the appearance of a bubble of air; whilst all other precious stones lose it.”—*Bulletin, &c. &c.*, pp. 332-334.

The discovery of diamonds in Russia, far from the tropical zone, has excited much interest among geologists. M. Maurice Engelhardt, who visited the Ural Mountains in 1826, observed the resemblance between the platina sand of that region and that of the diamond districts of Brazil. Humboldt observed a similar resemblance between the Brazilian and Uralian Mountains, and in June 1829 two of his companions, when exploring the western declivity of the Ural range, discovered diamonds. Seven of various sizes were found on the estates of Count Porlier, about 160 miles west of Perm. The Count himself found one in a species of gold and platinum sand. In the summer of 1830 other seven diamonds weighing from three-eighths of a carat to one carat were found among the gold dust on the same property. In the detritus on the banks of the Adolfskoi, no fewer than forty diamonds have been found in the gold alluvium only twenty feet above the stratum in which the remains of Mammoths and Rhinoceroses are found.*

* These diamonds were seen by Sir Roderick Murchison, in the cabinet of Prince Butera. Since that period Colonel Helmersen has shown that diamonds have been found at three points along the Ural chain, Ekaterineburg, Kushvinsk, and Versch-Urals.—*Geology of Russia*, p. 301, note.

* The owner of this specimen asked 3000 francs for it.

Hence Humboldt has concluded that the formation of gold veins, and consequently of diamonds, is comparatively of recent date, and scarcely anterior to the destruction of the Mammoths. Sir Roderick Murchison and M. Verneuil have been led to the same result by different arguments. Colonel Helmersen, who, along with Humboldt and Rose, regard the *Itacolumite* as the real site or matrix of the diamond, discovered that quartzose micaceous schist really occurs in the portion of the Ural adjacent to the diamond mines.

Diamonds have recently been found in Africa, whence they were obtained in ancient times. The museum of M. de Drée contains three diamonds lately purchased at Algiers, and found in washing for gold in the auriferous sands of the River Sumee, in the Province of Constantine. Mr. Feuchtwanger informs us that Mr. Featherstonhaugh discovered perfect crystallized diamonds, a green and a white one, in N. America, south of the Potomac, and he adds that Mr. Charles Clemson of Philadelphia exhibited to him a diamond found in North Carolina, of a distinct octohedral form, and weighing three grains; but these facts do not seem to be known to, or admitted by, American mineralogists. Mr. Murray mentions on the authority of the Reverend Dr. Robinson of the observatory at Armagh, that a rough diamond with a red tint and valued by Mr. Rundell at twenty guineas, was found in Ireland in the bed of a brook flowing through the county of Fermanagh. It was brought to a lady resident in the district by a girl, who said she had picked it up in the bed of the brook.

Having thus submitted to our readers an account of the most celebrated diamond mines in the world, and of the localities in which diamonds are found, we shall proceed to give a description of the largest and finest diamonds of which a correct account has been preserved.

The most noted of all the diamonds, and the one most interesting to Englishmen, is "The Diamond of the Great Mogul," subsequently known by the name of the Koh-i-noor, or Mountain of Light. Tavernier, the celebrated diamond merchant and traveller, was permitted by the Great Mogul to see this diamond and all his other jewels. He was allowed to weigh it, and he found its weight 319½ rattaes, which made 279 and 9-16th of our carats, one rattee being seven-eighths of a carat. This stone was part of a large one found in 1550 in the mine of Gani or Couleur, not far to the east of Golconda, and it came into the possession of the Great Mogul in the following manner:

—When Mirgimola, the commander of the forces of the King of Golconda, betrayed his master, he carried off with him this large diamond, and having been kindly welcomed by Shah Jehan, the Great Mogul, he gave it him as a present. It was then rough and uncut, and weighed 907 rattaes, which make 787½ carats. "It had," says Tavernier, "three several flaws in it, and if it had been in Europe, it would have been treated in a different manner; for very good pieces would have been got from it, and it would have remained when cut much heavier; whereas it has been all ground away. It was cut by the Sieur Hortensio Borgis, a Venetian diamond cutter, who was very ill rewarded for his labor, for when it was cut, they reproached him for having spoiled the stone which ought to have remained of a much greater weight; and instead of paying him for his trouble, the King made them take from him ten thousand rupees, and would have made them take more if he had had more to give." "Had the Sieur Hortensio," adds Tavernier, "been well acquainted with his profession, he might have obtained from this great stone some good pieces, without doing any injury to the King, and without having taken so much trouble in grinding it away; but he was not a very skilful diamond cutter."—"After having carefully contemplated," adds Tavernier, "this great stone, and having returned it into the hands of D'Akel Khan, he showed me another diamond, of a pear shape, and of a very good form and fine water, with three other table diamonds, two of them pure, and the other which has small dark points."

Having thus examined and weighed the diamond, Tavernier gives a drawing of it, and describes it as having the form of an egg cut through the middle. He says that it has a fine water, and is round and rose cut, very high on one side, and having on the lower edge a crack and a small flaw within. From this minute account of the Great Mogul diamond, there are certain conclusions that we are entitled to draw.

1. That the great rough diamond, belonging originally to the King of Golconda, and given by Mirgimola to Shah Jehan, was not cut into *two or more pieces* by the Venetian artist, but was *ground down* from 787½ to 279 carats, in consequence of the flaws which it contained. When Tavernier says that Hortensio, had he known his profession, might have obtained some good pieces by cutting the diamond, in place of grinding it down, he does not say this of his own knowledge, because he never saw the large rough diamond, but he says it on the

authority of persons who could not but know the fact, and who being interested in blaming the diamond-cutter, could only thus justify their harsh treatment of him, in fining him 10,000 rupees. It is very probable that the flaws rendered it necessary to grind down the diamond, in place of cutting off the parts separated by flaws, as was lately done in the Koh-i-noor, when they were obliged to grind it down to the required shape, in place of cutting off particular portions of it.

2. That the weight of the diamond thus cut was 279 carats, and that its shape was that of half of an egg, as drawn and described by Tavernier, a person thoroughly qualified to weigh, draw, and describe it

We have been unable to find at what date the diamond of the Great Mogul, which has the form of a *mountain*, received the name of Koh-i-noor, or the *Mountain of Light*. It was certainly not known under that name to the authors of the Hindoo Legends, which allege that it was worn by an Indian warrior who fell in battle in 3001 before Christ! According to the Autobiography of Baber, who became sovereign of Hindostan in 1526, Hamayun, the son of Baber, was sent, after the defeat of Ibrahim Lodi at the battle of Paniput, against Agra, the citadel of which had been held for Ibrahim by Bikermajit, Rajah of Gwalior, who fell in that battle. "The family of Bikermajit, as Baber himself relates, were at the time in Agra. Upon Hamayun's arrival they attempted to escape, but were stopped by the parties stationed to watch their movements, and were brought in prisoners. Hamayun would not permit them to be plundered, and of their own free will they presented to him a peshkash (or present), consisting of a quantity of jewels and precious stones, amongst which was *one famous diamond*, which had been acquired by Sultan Ala-ud-din. It is so valuable that a judge of diamonds estimated it at half of the daily expenses of the whole world! It is about eight mishkals in weight. On my arrival Hamayun presented it as a peshkash to me, and I gave it back to him as a present."*

Dr. Horace Wilson, the author of the learned and interesting account of the Koh-i-noor, in the *Official Descriptive and Illustrated Catalogue of the Great Exhibition*,† considers it as very possible that the diamond of Baber was the one which Tavernier saw in the treasury of the Great Mogul.

* *Memoirs of Baber*, translated by Dr. Leyden and Mr. Erskine, p. 308.

† Part III. pp. 695, 696.

The translators of Baber make eight mishkals equal to 320 rattees, which would give 280 carats as the weight of the diamond, the very same as that of the Great Mogul Diamond; but Dr. Wilson says, that "according to Ferishta, who repeats the story, the weight was eight mishkals or 224 rattees only, which would make it only 491 grains or 125 carats. Baber's expression is 'ghaliban,' which would indicate not actual but estimated weight: According to the actual valuation of the Arabian mishkal at 72 grains, the weight of Baber's diamond would be 576 grains, (or 144 carats,) but it is always difficult to fix with precision the value of Indian weights and measures, as they vary at different places and at different times. It is sufficient to determine that Baber obtained a diamond corresponding *nearly if not entirely in weight* and value with one found above a century later in the possession of his descendants. The weight, however, of Baber's diamond being *much the same* as that of Aurungzebe's, (Shah Jehan's brother), the story of the original weight and the loss in cutting is not to be relied on."

These views of Dr. Wilson appear to us quite untenable and even contradictory; but before we can make our readers understand the question at issue, we must examine Dr. Wilson's opinion that the Mogul Diamond of 279 carats, as weighed by Tavernier, is identical with the present Koh-i-noor, weighing 186 carats. To prove this identity, he makes Tavernier ignorant of the value of a rattee, and asserts that it "has been found by trial to be equal to $2\frac{3}{4}$ grains," instead of $3\frac{1}{2}$ grains, as Tavernier assumed. With this value of the rattee, Dr. Wilson makes the Mogul Diamond 175 carats, "which," he says, "is a sufficiently near approximation to the actual weight of the present Koh-i-noor, 186 carats." Now, admitting this low value of the rattee, will any person believe that Tavernier, a skilful diamond merchant, committed a mistake of *eleven carats*, or *forty grains*, in weighing the Mogul Diamond? But we cannot admit that Tavernier mistook the value of a rattee. If he did, he must have found all the diamonds which he purchased in India, and resold in Europe, little more than half the weight at which he bought them, having weighed them in India "with the native standard of weight, the rattee," as Dr. Wilson alleges. He must, therefore, have found out his mistake long before he published his *Travels*, and would certainly have corrected it. But, as Dr. Wilson himself tells us "that Indian weights vary in different places and different times," why do we doubt the

accuracy of Tavernier, (who bought diamonds in India by the rattee, and sold them in Europe by the carat,) when he distinctly tells us in his fourteenth chapter, "*On the diversity of weights used at the Diamond Mines,*" &c.,—

"That at the mine of Soumalpour in Bengal they weigh by raties, and the rati is seven-eighths of a carat, or three grains and a half. They use the same weights over all the empire of the Mogul."

We are now prepared to come to a decision respecting Baber's diamond. If eight mishkals are equal to 320 rattees, Baber's diamond is so exactly the same weight of the Mogul's, that we can scarcely doubt that they are identical, in which case the story of the cutting of the rough diamond of 793 carats must be false. Yet it is quite possible that there were two diamonds of nearly the same weight, in which case Tavernier's story may be true. But if we do not admit the translator of Baber's value of the mishkal, Baber's diamond must have been either 125 carats or 144, and, consequently, could not have been the Mogul diamond, as reduced to 175 carats by Dr. Wilson, nor the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats.

Having thus placed it beyond a doubt that the Baber diamond was neither the diamond of Shah Jehan of 279 carats, nor that of Runjeet Sing, now called the Koh-i-noor, we shall now enter upon the question introduced by Dr. Wilson, where he says, "It still remains to be established how far the great diamond of the Mogul Emperors is to be considered as the same with the Koh-i-noor, as that appellation is not given to it by the early writers."* Now, there are two kinds of evidence which may be adduced for or against the identity of these two diamonds—the testimony of history, and the still more important evidence to be derived from a comparison of their weight and form. There is certainly no distinct evidence that the Mogul diamond passed into the possession of the ruling family of Kabul. That they did possess it is "affirmed by the members of that family, and by the jewellers of Delhi and Kabul," but with such motives to adopt this opinion, who would place any trust in the affirmation either of the family or of the jewellers? It is doubt-

less true that when Nadir Shah occupied Delhi in 1739, Mohammed Shah, the great-grandson of Aurungzebe, surrendered to him the valuable contents of the imperial treasury, among which "his biographer and secretary specifies a peshkash or present by Mohammed Shah to his conqueror, of several magnificent diamonds." But this surely is no evidence at all that the great historical diamond of India was one of these diamonds. The biographer and secretary of Nadir Shah, who is said to have first used the name of Koh-i-noor, would never have overlooked the "Mountain of Light" among the lesser jewels which composed the peshkash. We regard this therefore as an evidence either that Mohammed Shah did not possess the diamond of his family, or did not surrender it to his conqueror. But it is not improbable, nay, we think it very probable, that the diamond of Runjeet Sing, the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats, was one of the *magnificent diamonds* referred to, and thus passed downwards through Ahmed Shah and his successors into the hands of Shah Shuja and Runjeet Sing. The historical evidence, therefore, entirely fails in identifying the Koh-i-noor with the diamond of the Great Mogul; nay, we are compelled, by the only part of the evidence which has any real bearing on the question, to infer that Nadir Shah never received from the descendants of Aurungzebe the Great Diamond of his family.

In entire conformity with these views is the physical testimony of weight and form—two sources of evidence which, taken separately, we consider irresistible, and which, when combined, amount to demonstration. Tavernier handled, and weighed, and delineated, and described the Mogul Diamond. Its weight was 279 $\frac{1}{2}$ carats—its form that of *half an egg*; it is of a *good shape*—it is *round rose-cut*, as elsewhere expressed, "there is a little flaw in the edge of the cutting below, which goes round about the stone." With this description the drawing perfectly agrees. Now the Koh-i-noor weighed only 186 carats; its form had not the least resemblance to half an egg; it was not round rose-cut; it was not of a good shape, but of a singularly bad one; and it had not the slightest resemblance to Tavernier's drawing. We have already seen how Dr. Wilson meets the argument from weight, and we trust we have satisfactorily answered it. We may now add that Tavernier's drawings of different diamonds are to a scale, along with diamonds sold to the King of France, by the carat; and by this scale the diamond of the Mogul, in place of being 175 carats, has the appearance of 279. But

* Dr. Wilson is aware that another value of the rati has been given, namely, 15-16th grains, in which case the Mogul diamond would weigh only 105 carats, and the Baber diamond only 73 or 84 carats, results which he himself will not admit. The rati is the seed of the *abrus piscatorius*, but it is certain that the weight known by this name is heavier than the seed.

not only is the Koh-i-noor in every respect dissimilar to the Mogul diamond, the two cannot be identified even by supposing that the 279 carats have been reduced to 286 by cutting off a slice of 93 carats, ($279 - 186 = 93$), because it is impossible to convert the Koh-i-noor into the Mogul diamond, by adding 93 carats to it, even in the smallest pieces or particles; and, of course, equally impossible to reduce the Mogul diamond into the Koh-i-noor by cutting a slice from it, or even by grinding it down.

This observation is of importance in reference to a theory brought forward by Dr. Beke in a notice read at the Ipswich meeting of the British Association, "*on a Diamond Slab supposed to have been cut from the Koh-i-noor.*"

"It appears," says Dr. Beke,* "that in 1832 the Persian army, under Abbas Meerza, Hereditary Prince of Persia, for the subjugation of Khorassan, found at the capture of Coocha, among the jewels of the harem of Reeza Kooli Khan, the chief of that place, a large diamond slab, supposed to have been cut from the Koh-i-noor. It weighed 130 carats, and shewed the marks of cutting on the flat or largest side. The only account that could be obtained of it was the statement that it was found in the possession of a poor man, a native of Khorassan, and that it had been employed in his family for the purpose of striking a light against a steel, and in this rough service it had sustained injury by constant use. The diamond was presented by Abbas Meerza to his father, Futteli Ali Shah, and is presumed to be among the crown jewels of Persia. The Armenian jewellers of Teheran asked the sum of 20,000 tomauns (£16,000 sterling) for cutting it, but the Shah was not inclined to incur the expense."†

This new theory of the Koh-i-noor is obviously in favour of our views, in so far as it shows that the relationship between it and the Mogul diamond can only be ascertained by supposing the one to be a portion of the other. The two portions, however, are unfortunately larger than the whole, for $186 + 130$ carats, are equal to 316 carats, $36\frac{1}{2}$ carats heavier than the Mogul diamond. The Persian stone, too, of 130 carats, must have been heavier before it was worn by the steel, and a considerable number of carats must have been removed by the cutting; so that we may estimate the difference between the great diamond and its two halves at nearly 50 carats, a difference which cannot be admitted. Besides, the large flat face of

the Koh-i-noor is one of the natural faces of the octohedron, and it is not likely that a diamond cutter would have cut so accurately in that place.

In order to remove the objection on the ground of weight, Mr. James Tennant, mineralogist to the Queen, has proposed a new and very ingenious theory, according to which the Koh-i-noor formed part of a larger stone which had been split into three pieces by two cleavage planes. The original rough diamond of the King of Golconda, of 793 carats, he supposes to have been split into the Great Mogul diamond of 279 carats, the Koh-i-noor of 186, and a *third* now among the crown jewels of Russia, the weight of which he has not been able to ascertain, but which must not exceed 328 carats, even if the great stone was split without loss. We have now before us a model explaining this theory, kindly sent us by Mr. Tennant. The original crystal is assumed to be the regular rhombic dodecahedron. The *first* slice is supposed to be "The Koh-i-noor," as diminished since it was weighed by Tavernier. It is cut from the dodecahedron by a broad plane parallel to a face of the octohedron. The *second* or inner slice next to this is also supposed to have been split from the Koh-i-noor, since it was seen by Tavernier. It is bounded by planes parallel to the face of the octohedron, and we presume that Mr. Tennant considers this slice as that mentioned by Dr. Beke, as among the crown jewels of Persia. The *third* or outer slice is supposed to be the Russian Diamond. We have also before us a drawing of the original rhombic dodecahedron by the Reverend Mr. Mitchell, with separate drawings of the three slices, and we willingly admit that this is the only method by which the Mogul diamond of 279, and the present Koh-i-noor of 186 carats, can be placed in crystallographic relationship. The truth of the theory, however, is another matter, and will speedily be tested, for Mr. Tennant has written to St. Petersburg for the weight and form of the Russian diamond, and the Persian Ambassador, Sheffee Khan, has kindly written to Persia for models of the royal diamond for our information. If the weights and planes of cleavage thus obtained are reconcilable with Mr. Tennant's theory, the coincidence, like many other coincidences, will be a very remarkable one; but, like the facts of clairvoyance and other apparently supernatural events, we never can regard it as anything but a coincidence. We have the highest evidence that the great rough diamond of 793 carats was never cut in pieces, but ground down to 279 carats; and when we consider that Tavernier himself

* Athenæum, July 5, 1851, p. 718; and Report of the British Association, 1851, p. 44.

† The above particulars were forwarded to Dr. Beke by his brother, Mr. William Beke, late Colonel of Engineers in the Persian service, who took part in the Khorassan campaign.

knew Mirgimola personally, and even visited him,—that he learned the facts of the grinding down of the diamond, and of the fining of the diamond cutter for doing this, not from tradition, but from the parties who were present, and who had no possible motive to deceive him, we must receive his testimony as overbearing any evidence of a physical kind.

It is obvious, we think, from the facts submitted to the reader, that there is no satisfactory evidence that the diamond of 279 carats, either in its unity or in its twin condition, came into the possession of Shah Shuja. We are willing, however, to believe the prevailing tradition, that he did possess either the original stone weighed by Tavernier, or the present Koh-i-noor, or both. It seems quite certain that the latter is the diamond which he surrendered to Runjeet Sing, and it has been confidently asserted by many gentlemen from India, that the Mogul diamond is still in that country; and if this is true, we have no means of ascertaining if it was ever in the hands of the Cabul family, or if it was retained by Shah Shuja when he presented an inferior one to the Lion of the Punjaub. There have been different accounts of the way in which this valuable gem came into the hands of Runjeet. The following account given by Dr. Wilson is probably the most correct.

“When Shah Shuja was driven from Kabul, he became the nominal guest and actual prisoner of Runjit Sing, who spared neither opportunity nor menace, until, in 1813, he compelled the fugitive monarch to resign the precious gem, presenting him on the occasion, it is said, with a lakh and 25,000 rupees, or about £12,000 sterling. According to Shah Shuja's own account, however, he assigned to him the revenues of three villages, not one rupee of which he ever realized. Runjit was highly elated by the acquisition of the diamond, and wore it as an armlet at all public festivals. When he was dying, an attempt was made by persons about him to persuade him to make the diamond a present to Jagannath, and it is said he intimated, by an inclination of his head, his assent. The treasurer, however, in whose charge it was, refused to give it up without some better warrant, and Runjit dying before a written order could be signed by him, the Koh-i-noor was preserved for a while for his successors. It was occasionally worn by Khuruk Sing and Shir Sing. After the murder of the latter, it remained in the Lahore Treasury until the supercession of Dhulip Sing, and the annexation of the Punjab by the British Government, when the civil authorities took possession of the Lahore Treasury, under the stipulation previously made, that all the property of the State should be confiscated to the East India Company, in part payment of the debt due by the Lahore government, and of the expenses of the war.

It was at the same time stipulated that the Koh-i-noor should be surrendered to the Queen of England. The diamond was conveyed to Bombay by Governor-General the Earl of Dalhousie, whom ill-health had compelled to repair to the coast, and was thus given in charge to Lieut.-Col. Mackeson, C. B., and Capt. T. Ramsay, the Military Secretary to the Governor-General, to take to England. These officers embarked on board Her Majesty's steam-ship *Medea*, and left Bombay on the 6th of April 1850. They arrived at Portsmouth on the 30th of June, and two days afterwards relinquished their charge to the chairman and deputy-chairman of the Court of Directors, by whom, in company with the President of the Board of Control, the Koh-i-noor was delivered to Her Majesty on the 3d of July—an appropriate and honourable close to its eventful career.”

The history of the Koh-i-noor, since it came into the possession of Her Majesty, is known to most of our readers. It was seen by thousands at the Great Exhibition, but owing to the manner in which it was cut, and to the great breadth of light which was incident upon its facets from the glass roof of the Crystal Palace, it exhibited less lustre and fewer colours than its glass models. But when fifteen or sixteen gas lights were placed behind it, which was done upon our recommendation, it threw out the most brilliant flashes of coloured light, which delighted those who took the trouble of moving their head into different positions in order to catch the refracted pencils which corresponded to the different jets of light by which it was shewn.

As the Koh-i-noor in the state in which it reached England was of no value as an ornamental gem, it was Her Majesty's wish to have it re-cut into such a form as would display its intrinsic beauty, and make it a true ornament. After consulting persons qualified to give an opinion respecting the best form to be given to it, it was entrusted to Mr. Garrard the Crown jeweller, who by a process of cutting which we shall by and by describe, has rendered it one of the finest ornamental diamonds which exists in Europe.

As the origin and growth of the diamond is one of the most perplexing and interesting questions in modern science, Sir David Brewster, who had devoted much time to the study of the structure and properties of that body, was anxious to examine such a large mass as the Koh-i-noor, before it was reduced in size, and unfitted for examination by the new form which was to be given it. Having been consulted by His Royal Highness Prince Albert respecting the form into which it should be cut, he received permission to examine it in its entire state; and in a future part of this Article we shall give a

brief account of the experiments which he made, and of the views to which they conducted him.

The next diamond which claims our attention is the Pitt or Regent Diamond, which, in its rough state, as brought from Golconda, weighed 410 carats, and 136 $\frac{1}{2}$ when cut. It was purchased by Thomas Pitt, when governor of Fort-George, Madras, in December 1701, who states that when it was brought to him as a large rough stone it weighed 305 mangelins, or nearly 420 carats, reckoning a mangelin equal to 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ carats. He paid for it 48,000 pagodas, or £20,400, reckoning the pagoda at 8s. 6d. It was cut into a fine brilliant, in the shape of an obtuse quadrangle, one inch and two lines long, one inch one and a-half lines broad, and ten lines thick. The cutting of it occupied two years, and the expense thus incurred was, according to one account, £3666, and others, £5000.* It was purchased in 1717, in the minority of Louis XV., by the Duke of Orleans, when Regent of France, and thus got the name of the Regent Diamond. This diamond is allowed to be the finest in the world, (though not the largest,) in beauty of form and in the purity of its water. Jeffries informs us that it has only one small foul speck in it, which cannot be seen when the stone is set. The Kings of France wore this diamond in their hats, and Napoleon had it fixed in the pomel of his sword; but it was subsequently transferred to the French crown, where it presides over 5300 of the finest brilliants, weighing together 1738 carats, and 96 of the most perfect sapphires, weighing 711 carats. The crown was made by M. Pabst, a native of Germany, and jeweller to the King. According to Patrin this diamond was carried to Berlin, which corresponds with a report mentioned by Mr. Murray, that, "it was played with such success before the king of Prussia, by the wily Sieyes, as to produce for the service of France 40,000 horses with their equipments." Mr. Murray was also informed that Charles X. tried to carry it off, and "that it was taken from his person on leaving France." According to one statement, it was valued in 1791, by a commission of jewellers, at twelve millions of livres; and according to a MS. now before us, at £458,333, which is nearly the amount of twelve million of livres.

The next diamond in point of size and beauty is that of the Rajah of Mattan, in Borneo, which we have already mentioned in our account of the diamond mines of that island. It was, according to Sir Stamford

Raffles, found about the close of the last century, by a Dayak, and claimed as a droit of royalty by Guru Layo, the sultan of the country, but was handed over to the Pangaran of Landak, whose brother having got possession of it, gave it as a bribe to the Sultan of Succadana, in order that he might be placed on the throne of Landak. The lawful prince, however, having fled to Bantam, by the aid of the prince of that country and the Dutch, he succeeded in regaining possession of his district, and nearly destroyed Succadana. Sir Stamford Raffles adds, that it has remained an heir-loom in the family for four descents, and is almost the only appendage of royalty now remaining.* The Mattan diamond is said to be of the finest water, and to weigh 367 carats.† Sir Stamford Raffles says that it was *uncut* when he wrote, but since it is now cut, (as we infer from a drawing of its superficies, in which the facets are placed with great symmetry and beauty,) we have no means of ascertaining how much it may have been reduced in weight. Many years ago the Governor of Batavia was anxious to purchase it. He sent Mr. Stewart to Borneo, to offer for it to the Rajah 150,000 dollars, two large war-brigs, with their guns and ammunition, and a large quantity of powder and shot. But as the fortunes of the family are believed to depend upon the possession of the diamond, and as the Malays regard it as possessing the miraculous power of curing all kinds of diseases by means of the water in which the diamonds are dipped, the Rajah refused to deprive the family of so rich an inheritance, and his people of so valuable a medicine.

Though an inferior stone, the one next in weight to the preceding is the largest table diamond in the world. It weighs 242 carats and 5-16ths. Tavernier saw it at Golconda in 1642, and says that "it was the biggest he ever saw in his life in a merchant's hands." It was valued at 500,000 rupees, or 750,000 livres. He offered 400,000 rupees for it, but could not get it at that price. In a MS. before us, it is said to be remarkable for its purity, but inferior in shape, regular cut, and brilliancy, to the stones already mentioned. It is of a rectangular form, with one of its angles cut off. Its length is two inches, its breadth one inch and one line, and its thickness three lines only. Its upper surface has four facets, one on each edge, and it is quite flat below. Hence, as the writer of the MS. observes, it has no better appearance than a piece of the purest rock crystal. It was sold, he adds, for £4000, but he does not

* The chips and filings, amounting to nearly two-thirds of the original stone, were valued at nearly £8000.

* History of Java, vol. i. p. 266.

† Memoirs of the Batavian Society.

say to whom, and we have not been able to discover its purchaser or its present locality.

The next largest diamond is one which belongs to the king of Persia. Its weight, as we learn from the Persian ambassador, is 232 carats, and it is known by the name of the *Deria-i-noor*, or *the Sea of Light*. In the East India Company's office in Leadenhall Street, there is a portrait of the king of Persia, the grandfather of the present king, in which the *Deria-i-noor* may be seen placed on his right arm.

The great diamond in the sceptre of the Emperor of Russia, which has been called the *Effingham* diamond, was brought to England by the Earl of Effingham while Governor-General of India. We cannot discover how it left England, but it is said to have been purchased by a Jew for £17,000 or £18,000. After having frequently changed hands it came into the possession of a Greek merchant, Gregory Suffras, (another account says an American merchant named Luzauf,) from whom it was purchased by Prince Orloff for the Empress Catherine of Russia, who gave for it £84,500, and an annuity of \$3660, together with a patent of nobility. It now adorns the imperial sceptre of Russia, being placed immediately beneath the golden eagle which surmounts it. This diamond was one of the eyes of an idol of Malabar, called *Scheringham*. A French grenadier who had deserted from the Indian service contrived to become one of the inferior priests of the idol, and having secreted himself in the temple, he stole its diamond eye. He then went to the English camp at Trichinopoly, and afterwards to Madras, where a ship captain bought it for 20,000 rupees. Its weight is $194\frac{3}{4}$ carats. Its shape is a circular pyramid, with five concentric rows of facets: At the top of the pyramid the facets are sectors of a circle, sixteen in number, meeting in the centre or summit of the pyramid. Its base forms a rhomboid, whose greatest length is 1 inch and 4 lines, and its thickness 10 lines.

Tavernier gives a drawing of a diamond which he bought at Amadabad, and which weighed $157\frac{1}{4}$ carats. It has a sort of pear shape, with a deep rounded groove along its whole length, with seven black specks and three triangular black cavities. How he disposed of it is not mentioned, and where it is now we cannot discover.

The fine diamond which originally belonged to the Grand Duke of Tuscany has been drawn by Tavernier. Its weight is $139\frac{1}{2}$ carats, and the fault of it, he says, is, that the water of it inclines somewhat to a citron colour. It passed into the hands of the Empe-

ror of Austria,* and is now exhibited in the imperial treasury at Vienna, where it attracts universal admiration. It is not regularly cut, and has neither the proper form of a rose nor that of a brilliant. Its lustre and brilliancy are greatly increased by its star-like cut, and though tinged with a shade of yellow it is, from its form and weight, one of the rarest specimens of its kind. It is 1 inch 2 lines long, and one inch broad. It is surrounded with other fine brilliants, and neatly mounted in a large *sevigné*. Its value is estimated at £90,000.

The discovery of the *Abaethé* diamond in Brazil has been already mentioned. Mr. Mawe in one place says, that its weight was nearly an ounce Troy, and in another *seven-eighths* of an ounce, (105 carats,) and yet he states in the same paragraph what is entirely inconsistent with this weight, that it "is perhaps the largest diamond in the world." In his *Treatise on Diamonds*, published eleven years afterwards, he repeats the statement of its being in the rough nearly an ounce Troy in weight. This diamond is not even mentioned by Mr. Murray; but he describes another diamond under the same name of the *Abaethé* diamond, and connects with its discovery the very same story of the three convicts which Mr. Mawe tells in reference to the diamond of an ounce Troy. Mr. Murray describes it as the largest in the world—the size of an ostrich egg, and weighing 1680 carats! *Romé de L'Isle* in his *Treatise on Crystallographie*, published in 1783, says, that "the most extraordinary stone which has been obtained from the mines of Brazil is a diamond (some pretend that it is a white topaz) which the present king of Portugal possesses, and which weighs 1680 carats, (*c'est à dire onze onces, cinq gros, vingt quatre grains.*) Besides this diamond, which is preserved rough," he adds, "this sovereign possesses another of less size but of rare beauty, which weighs 215 carats, and is consequently one of the largest that is known."[†] Mr. Murray mentions this diamond of 215 carats, under the name of the *Round Brilliant* of Portugal, which he says is extremely fine, and has been estimated at £388,290. *Romé de L'Isle* says that the figure and size of the great diamond of 1680 carats is given in the *Journal Economique*,[‡] and he values it at £224,000,000 sterling, whereas, according to Jeffries' rule it should be only £5,644,800.

* *Journal Historique et Politique de Genève*, 28th February 1775, p. 316.

† *Crystallographie*. 2d Edition. Vol. ii. p. 208. Paris, 1783.

‡ July, 1781, p. 141.

Mr. Murray says, that "Mr. Mawe, who had attentively examined it, informed him that he considered it to be a *white topaz*, and not a diamond," which we have no doubt is true.

The Sancy diamond, the product of the Indian mines, was brought to France by Baron de Sancy, who was the French ambassador at Souleure. Its weight is $53\frac{1}{2}$ carats, and, according to Dutens,* cost £25,000, which was far below its value. It is what is called a *brisset*, that is, pear shaped, and covered on both sides with triangular rose facets, the effect of which method of cutting is to diminish greatly the value which it would otherwise have derived from its great purity and fine water. The following history of it is given by Mr. Murray :—

"This diamond was originally brought from India, and has remained in France for the last four centuries. Charles the Bold, Duke of Burgundy, wore it in his helmet at the battle of Nancy, near the Lake Morat, in Switzerland, in 1475, and in which he fell. He is represented in the vignette of a MS. in the Bibliothèque Royale, wearing in his hat that which was afterwards taken in his baggage by the Swiss, after the battle of Grandison. It was found by a Swiss soldier among the spoils of the battle, and sold to a priest for a florin (1s. 8d.), who afterwards disposed of it for three francs (2s. 6d.) We subsequently, in the year 1849, trace the Sancy diamond to the possession of Antonio, King of Portugal, who being in want of money, first pledged it for 40,000 livres, and afterwards disposed of it entirely for the sum of 100,000 livres, to a French gentleman of the name of De Sancy. Nicolas Harlai de Sancy had it afterwards by succession. At the time of the Baron de Sancy's embassy at Souleure, Henry III. requiring money to recruit his forces, borrowed the diamond in order to pledge it for a sum of money, and it was entrusted to a confidential servant who was waylaid and assassinated by a band of robbers. The body, however, after some search, was found buried in a wood, and on being opened, discovered the gem, the servant having swallowed it at the first onset. Baron de Sancy afterwards disposed of it to James II. of England, in 1688, when he had escaped to France, and remained at St. Germain. From him it passed to Louis XIV., and Louis XV. wore it in his hat at his coronation. Its form is somewhat pear shaped, and is of the purest brilliancy."

This fine diamond has been lately purchased by Count Demidoff, the Grand Almoner of the Emperor of Russia, for 500,000 rubles.

The *Nussac* Diamond, weighing, according to one account, $89\frac{3}{4}$ carats, and according to another $79\frac{1}{2}$, was captured during the

Mahratta war in India, in the Peishwa's baggage, by the combined armies under the Marquis of Hastings. It is said to have been presented by the Marquis, as from himself, to the East India Company, but it was afterwards given up to form part of the Deccan booty. It remained ten years in the possession of Rundell and Bridge, and was purchased at a public sale in 1837 by Emanuel Brothers, for £7200, scarcely one-third of its estimated value. The *Nussac* diamond, and the diamond ear-rings, weighing 56 carats, and purchased for £11,000, were sold by him to the Marquis of Westminster, in whose possession they now are. The form of this diamond is triangular, and it has been cut and polished so as to retain the greatest possible weight.

The *Pigott* Diamond, not now in existence, was a "brilliant of great surface both in table and girdle," and from its superior water was the finest in Europe. Its weight was $47\frac{1}{2}$ carats. In 1801 it was sold by lottery for £30,000. It became the property of a young man, who sold it at a low price. It was again disposed of, and Rundell and Bridge, into whose possession it afterwards came, sold it for the same sum to Ali Pacha, who always wore it in a green silk purse attached to his girdle. Mr. Murray informs us, "that when Ali Pacha was mortally wounded by Reschid Pacha, he immediately retired to his Divan, and desired that his favourite wife Vasilika should be poisoned, and he gave the diamond to Captain D'Anglas, with orders that it should be crushed to powder in his presence, which was forthwith done, and the beautiful gem utterly destroyed. Vasilika still lives, but the model of the diamond alone remains. The too obedient officer bitterly regretted his folly, and the destroyed diamond haunted him in his dreams for months afterwards."

The *Vienna Rose* Diamond is considered a remarkable specimen of large diamonds. It has the form of a square truncated at the angles. Its length is 1 inch 3 lines, its breadth 1 inch 2 lines, and it is very thick in the girdle. The upper face of the stone is flat, but not rising into a crown, as is invariably the case in a fine regularly cut Dutch *Rose* Diamond. Owing to these imperfections, its beauty is now less than might be expected from a brilliant of the same size. Its weight is 96 carats, and its estimated value \$15,000.

In the King of Saxony's Repository at Dresden, called the *Green Vault*, there is a diamond called the *Saxon White Brilliant*, of considerable size and great beauty. It is of the first water, perfectly transparent, and of a pleasing form. It glitters and

* *Des Pierres Précieuses*, p. 81.

sparkles with unusual brilliancy of colour. It adorns the insignia of the order of the Gold Fleece, and is surrounded with other fine brilliants. It is 1 inch and 1 line square. It weighs $48\frac{3}{4}$ carats, and from its fine shape and great perfection, it is said to have been purchased by King Augustus for £143,833.

We have already mentioned the *Deria-noor*, or the *Sea of Light*, as weighing 232 carats. Mr. Murray says that its weight is 186, and that it is placed in a pair of bracelets valued at nearly a million sterling, along with the *Taj-e-Mah*, or *Crown of the Moon*, which weighs 146 carats. The Persian crown contains two diamonds of great size and value, namely, the *Sea of Glory*, weighing 66 carats, and valued at £34,848, and the *Mountain of Splendour*, weighing 135 carats, and valued at £145,800.

Our limits will not permit us to describe any of the colourless diamonds of inferior weight and value. We must, however, call the attention of our readers to the most interesting coloured diamonds which are known to exist. The value of a diamond is greatly enhanced if it is either *pink*, *blue*, or *green*. The *yellow* colour, which is not prized, passes into wine colour, and through cinnamon brown into black. The pale green passes into yellowish green, the bluish grey into Prussian blue, and the pink into rose red.

Such of our readers as visited the Great Exhibition of 1851 must have seen and admired the fine *blue* diamond of Mr. Hope which was exhibited in the gallery. To use the words of Mr. Hertz, this diamond is "a most magnificent and rare brilliant of a deep sapphire blue, of the greatest purity, and most beautifully cut: it is of true proportions, not too thick nor too spread. This matchless gem combines the beautiful colour of the sapphire with the prismatic fire and brilliancy of the diamond, and on account of its extraordinary colour, great size, and other fine qualities, it certainly may be called *unique*, as we may presume that there exists no cabinet, nor any collection of crown jewels in the world which can boast of the possession of so curious and fine a gem."* This diamond is mounted as a medallion with a border of small rose diamonds, surrounded by twenty brilliants, of the finest water and equal size, shape, and cutting, and averaging one carat each. The weight is forty-four carats, and the price once asked for it was £30,000. We are informed by Mr. Tennant that Mr.

Hope gave £13,000 for it, and that it had been several times pledged for a much larger sum, viz., £15,000, and that £16,000 had been lent upon it. Messrs. Rundell and Bridge regarded this as the finest blue diamond ever known, and Mr. Mawe on referring to it calls it "a superlatively fine blue diamond, which may be considered matchless."

Other three blue diamonds have been mentioned or described. One of these is a rich *sky blue* brilliant belonging to the crown jewels of France. It weighs $67\frac{2}{6}$ th carats, and has been valued at three millions of livres: another, of a splendid blue colour, and of great beauty and rarity, was purchased by George IV. from Mr. Eliason. It weighs $44\frac{1}{2}$ carats, cost £22,000, and was the principal ornament of the crown on the day of his coronation. The third blue diamond, called the "Blue Brilliant of Bavaria," is in the Royal Treasury at Munich. It is a perfectly regular *treble** cut brilliant. Its length is one inch, its breadth ten lines, and its weight thirty-six carats. The colour varies from the soft velvet blue of a perfect sapphire to the colour of steel. It is quite pure, and sparkles with the highest lustre. It is surrounded with beautiful white brilliants, in the Order of the Golden Fleece.

In the King of Saxony's Green Vault at Dresden, there is a large green diamond, which, in point of brilliancy and purity, is said to surpass every other known green diamond. It is cut into an oblong form. Its length is one inch and one line, its breadth ten lines, and its weight forty carats. It is mounted on a clasp, and is set round with large white brilliants. The price paid for this gem is kept a profound secret.

The Vienna *Rose* coloured diamond is one inch long, and nine lines broad. It weighs thirty-two carats, and has the shape of an obtuse oval. It is a regularly cut brilliant, and is of the finest rose colour and the greatest lustre. It is set in the middle of a knot of white brilliants, to which the decoration of the cross of Maria Theresa is attached.

Having thus given a history and description of the various diamond mines in different parts of the world, and of the finest diamonds which they have yielded, we shall now proceed to give a brief account of the form, the composition, the structure, and the origin of this singular body.

Like all other crystallized bodies, the diamond is found in two different conditions, the one amorphous or shapeless, like

* *Catalogue of Mr. Hope's Collection*, p. 25.

* A brilliant is said to be *treble* cut when the large facets on its side are flattened or cut into two smaller facets.

a pebble water-worn, or rounded by attrition in the bed of a stream,—the other a geometrical solid of great beauty, sometimes with its planes or faces rounded, as in the spheroidal diamond, and sometimes with its faces smooth and flat. These crystals are sometimes composed of two, and are then called hemitrope or twin crystals, and sometimes of a great number aggregated together, and yet the whole mass preserving the general form of a single crystal.* The general forms of the diamond are the cube, the regular octohedron, and the dodecahedron, the first with *four* faces, the second with *eight*, and the *third* with twelve. The second of these forms may be produced from the first, by cutting off all its *four* angles, till the faces of the cube disappear, and the solid thus produced is the octohedron, or the primitive form of the diamond, *i.e.*, every diamond may be reduced by cleavage to this form. The inclination of the faces of the octohedron to each other is $109^{\circ} 28' 16''$, and that of the faces of the octohedron to the faces of the cube, $125^{\circ} 15' 52''$.

It has been long known that the diamond, unlike all mineral bodies whatever, consists of vegetable matter which can be burned. Sir Isaac Newton had conjectured from its high refractive power, that the diamond was "an unctuous substance coagulated," and in 1694 a diamond of nearly 8 carats was so volatilized by a burning glass at Florence that the pieces into which it broke were dissolved. The same experiment has been often repeated, and in our own day Sir H. Davy, with the Grand Duke of Tuscany's burning glass, found that a diamond introduced into a glass globe supplied with oxygen, and kindled by the solar rays, continued to burn after it was removed from the focus. Carbonic acid gas was the exclusive result of the experiment. Sir George Mackenzie of Coul was the first person in this country who burned diamonds, making a free use of his mother's jewels; and by means of diamond powder he converted iron into steel. Mr. Smithson Tennant, the founder of the Smithsonian Institution in America, volatilized a diamond in a gold tube with a stream of oxygen, and found that the oxygen gas was transformed into an equal volume of *carbonic acid gas*. The diamond is therefore pure *carbon*, and hence various attempts have been made to make artificial diamonds, but hitherto without success. About twenty-five years ago M. Cagnard de la Tour announced that he had formed a diamond by crystallizing charcoal, but M. Thenard found that the

crystals were only silicates.* As M. Ebelman has succeeded in making several minerals and gems by an artificial process, such as perowskite, glucine, rutile, spinelle, ruby, peridot or chrysolite, and cymophane or chrysoberyl,† we may reasonably expect that the other precious stones, and the diamond itself, will yield to the advancing science of the age.‡

In its physical properties, as well as in its commercial value, the diamond transcends all the other gems. It is the hardest of all mineral bodies, scratching zircon, sapphire, ruby, rock-crystal, and all the gems, and cannot be scratched by any of them. The specific gravity of water being 1, that of diamond is 3.55, that is, a cubical inch of diamond would be equal in weight to a little more than $3\frac{1}{2}$ cubic inches of water. Its *refractive* powers, that is, its power to bend a ray of light incident obliquely upon its surface, is 2.439, that of water being 1.336, and glass 1.500; but in this respect it is surpassed by octohedrite, artificial Realgar and Greenockite. Its power of *dispersing* a ray of white light, that is, of separating it into its component colours in reference to its refractive power, is only 0.038, whereas plate glass is 0.052, and oil of cassia 0.139, so that in this respect it is inferior to a vast number of fluids as well as solids. It is a curious fact, which we believe has not been noticed by optical writers, that this inferiority of dispersive power is necessary to the production of those splendid coloured refractions to which it owes all its value as an ornamental gem. Its high refractive power separates the red and blue rays more than a high dispersive does in most other bodies, and sufficiently to give each colour of the spectrum its full force. Had its dispersive power, on the other hand, been greater, the colours would have been widely separated, and proportionally diluted or weakened in intensity, and the green and blue rays would, in many of the most inclined facets, have been unable to emerge from the front surface of the stone. Hence the superiority of the diamond, as an ornamental gem, depends not only on its high refractive power, which alone separates the colours of white light to a very great degree, but also on its low dispersive power which prevents them from being separated too much, and detained as it were within the stone, or rather, prevented from emerging from it after reflection.

* See *Edinburgh Journal of Science*, 1827, vol. x. p. 369.

† See *Comptes Rendus*, &c., 1851, tom. xxxii. p. 330, 710. 713, and tom. xxxiii. p. 525.

‡ M. Despretz, a distinguished Member of the Institute of France, is specially occupied with this class of experiments.

* This is finely seen in a specimen now before us, belonging to Mr. Tennant.

A part of the beauty of the diamond, but only a small part of it, depends upon the great quantity of white light which is reflected from the outer surface of its facets, and gives it a sort of metallic or adamantine lustre. It is obvious, however, that if no light were thus reflected, and if it all entered the stone, and therefore suffered refraction, we should have the same quantity of light reflected back again in a coloured state, rather than in the state of white light. This property, which belongs to all bodies of a high refractive power, of reflecting much light both when it enters and quits them, has the effect of making the most transparent and perfectly colourless specimens of diamond, that is, those of the *purest water*, as it is technically expressed, less transparent than either pure water or pure glass; because the quantity of light reflected from the two surfaces of a plate of diamond is taken from the quantity transmitted, so that, were such a thing possible, a window glazed with plates of diamond would make a darker room than one glazed with colourless glass.

The diamond exhibits vitreous electricity, that is, the same as glass by friction, and it is stated, though we have not succeeded in confirming the statement, that when a diamond is held *for an instant* in the pure light, it exhibits a phosphorescence which lasts a considerable time. It is not improbable that this effect may be produced by the impression of light upon the retina, which continues for the third of a second, and that the subsequent luminous appearance may be the accidental or complementary colour in the observer's eye.

We come now to the most important part of our subject, to an examination of the internal structure of the diamond, as compared with that of other gems, and to explain some very simple and infallible methods of distinguishing the diamond from all other precious stones, and from artificial imitations of it; and also of distinguishing the precious stones from one another, and from the coloured glass imitations of them with which they are so often confounded.

In order that the general reader may peruse these pages with some degree of intelligence, we may remark that, within the last forty years, very remarkable properties of light have been discovered, which enable us to study the interior structure of organized bodies, whether they belong to the animal, the vegetable, or the mineral world. The light, which puts this power into our hands, is called *polarized light*, and is distinguished from common light by peculiar properties. The light of the sun, and moon, and of all flames is *common light*; but when these

lights are reflected from the surface of transparent solids or fluids, at angles varying with the nature of the body, from 50° to 68° , they are by this reflection converted into *polarized light*.

When we transmit light, whether *common* or *polarized*, through a piece of well annealed glass, it suffers no change, and we see no structure in the glass different from what we would see if we looked through pure water. But if we make heat pass through the glass, by placing the edge of the plate of glass upon a heated iron, or if we either bend or compress the glass by mechanical force, its structure, or the mechanical condition of its particles, will be changed. If we now transmit *common* light through the glass thus changed, the change will not be visible; but if we transmit *polarized* light through it, and again analyze that light by reflection from a transparent body at an angle between 50° and 68° , and in a plane at right angles to that in which the common light was reflected and polarized, the observer, looking through the glass, will see the most brilliant colours, indicating the effects of the compressing or dilating forces, or of the contracting or expanding cause,—the degrees of compression or dilatation, of contraction or expansion being indicated by the colours displayed at particular parts of the glass. In this way polarized light enables us to discover that certain portions of a body have been subject to certain mechanical forces, the nature of which must be sought for in the circumstances under which the body has been originally formed, or in which it has been subsequently placed.

In applying this principle to the examination of transparent solids, such as gums, resins, glass, minerals, and precious stones, we are met with a difficulty which it is sometimes impossible to surmount. We can easily shape gums, resins, and glass, and even ordinary minerals, so as to make light pass through them, and exhibit, to the eye which receives it, the structure they possess; but when the minerals are *precious stones*, either cut or uncut, and when we cannot shape them to transmit light, we must adopt a special process to obtain the same, or, in some cases, a much better result.

If a solid body has the same refractive power as a fluid, or the same power of bending the rays of light out of their path, it is obvious that if we place a fragment of the solid, such as a piece of broken flint-glass, through which we can see nothing, in a fluid of the same refractive power, such as oil of aniseeds, the light will pass from the oil into the glass, and again out of the glass into the oil without suffering any change in its

direction. The observer will therefore see through the glass distinctly, and through all its various thicknesses, and he will even be able to read through what is in reality a broken and rugged fragment.* By this process we see what could not be seen by any other process; for if a lapidary had cut parallel faces upon the glass, we could only have seen through it in certain directions and through certain thicknesses; whereas by the present method we can see through the fragment in every possible direction and through every degree of thickness.

The method now described will apply to an immense number of transparent minerals and other bodies; but it is applicable only very imperfectly to the diamond, zircon, garnet, sapphire, and ruby, and most imperfectly to the diamond, on account of there being no fluids whatever whose refractive power is as high as that of these five precious stones, as will appear from the following Table:—

Solid Bodies.	Refractive Power.		
Diamond,	2.439	No fluids of nearly the same refractive power.	
Zircon, -	1.961		
Garnet, -	1.815		
		Fluid Bodies.	Refractive Power.
Sapphire,	1.794	Muriate of antimony,	1.800
Ruby, -	1.794		
Spinnelle, -	1.764		
Chrysoberyl,	1.760		
Eucrase, -	1.643	Sulphate of carbon, -	1.678
Topaz, -	1.632	Oil of cassia, -	1.641
		Oil of cassia diluted with oil of olives may be employed for all inferior degrees of refractive power.	
Emerald,	1.585		
Aquamarine,	1.585		
Amethyst,	1.564		
Cairngorm,	1.564		

It is obvious from this Table that *muriate*, or *butter*, of *antimony* may be used for sapphire, ruby, spinelle, and chrysoberyl, and it would even do for garnet. *Sulphuret of carbon* would answer for certain minerals, and *oil of cassia* would answer for eucrase, and, when diluted with oil of olives, for all the gems from eucrase to cairngorm, and for all minerals, &c. of inferior refractive power. We have, therefore, no method of looking through crystallized or cut diamonds with any degree of satisfaction; but it is obvious that some advantage may be gained by plunging them in *muriate of antimony*, or *sulphuret of carbon*, or even *oil of cassia*. Hence we are forced to study the structure of the diamond through flat plates or lasks, as they are called, or through certain table diamonds, when we can see through faces

slightly inclined, or when we can cement a prism of glass upon any of their faces, to refract the rays in an opposite direction, and permit them to reach the eye, as nearly as possible, colourless.

It was by the application of all these processes that Sir David Brewster was enabled to exhibit the remarkable optical structure of the Diamond, which had not previously been the subject of investigation. In 1815 he examined *fourteen* specimens of diamond, and found that seven depolarized light, in virtue of an irregular structure which others did not possess. He subsequently, in the same year, examined *nine* diamonds, in all of which this irregular structure was exhibited. In one of these diamonds, of which he has given a drawing, there are various patches of depolarizing structure, some of which are in a state of compression, and others of dilatation, as if a soft substance had been kneaded, as it were, and pressed in different directions; while in another specimen there were three luminous bands, two of which exhibited the action of a compressing, and the intermediate one of a dilating force. M. Biot, in commenting upon these experiments, gave it as his opinion that these effects were the result of heat or of rapid evaporation;* but whatever was the cause, which this could not be, it is clear that the diamond has been in such a state as to yield to mechanical influences which have not operated upon other regularly crystallized bodies—that is, it has been in a *soft state*. The truth of this opinion was subsequently demonstrated by new experiments published in 1835. In a diamond laske with parallel surfaces he found two black specks of different sizes, which, under the microscope, proved to be cavities, round which, when examined by polarized light, there were four luminous wings or sectors separated by a black cross, and appeared a compressed structure. It was impossible to discover what these cavities contained, whether a fluid or a vapour, or a compressed gas; but they obviously contained something which had a mechanical energy capable of compressing the diamond, and it is equally obvious that the diamond was in a *soft state* when this force was exerted. These conclusions may startle ordinary readers; but when they know that cavities containing fluids, vapours, and compressed gas have been discovered in topaz and other precious stones, by Sir David Brewster, and the fluids, vapour, and gas actually taken out of them, their surprise will cease.

Such was the state of our information re-

* This experiment was first made by Sir David Brewster, and used for measuring the refractive power of fragments of minerals and other bodies.

* *Traité de Physique*, tom. iv. p. 573.

specting the interior structure of the diamond when the Koh-i-noor arrived in England, and was shown in the Great Exhibition. As this beautiful diamond had been cut, not to display its brilliant colours, but merely to preserve it of as great a weight as possible, it had no value as an ornamental gem. Her Majesty, therefore, was naturally desirous of having it re-cut, and wishing to have this done in the best manner, and with the least loss of weight, the opinion of different individuals was taken. In a Paper read at the Geological section of the British Association at Belfast,* Sir David Brewster stated, that having been consulted on this point by his Royal Highness Prince Albert, he expressed his anxiety to examine so large a mass of diamond before it was reduced in size, and rendered unfit for examination by the facets with which it would be covered. His request was graciously granted, and he accordingly examined it at Buckingham Palace with the microscope, and by the aid of polarized light. Its general structure was such as he had found in smaller diamonds, but of course much more beautifully displayed. The polarized tints produced by compression were as high as the *blue* of the *second* order of colours, though in many places not higher than the *white* and the *yellow* of the first order. Near the very centre of the diamond there were three black specks scarcely visible to the eye, but which the microscope shewed to be *cavities surrounded with* sectors of polarized light. These cavities were of a very irregular shape, and the sectors of light partook a little of that irregularity. In the two smaller diamonds there were also several cavities with sectors of polarized light, and the same polarizing structure which indicates the existence of compressing and dilating forces.

On one side of the Koh-i-noor there was an incision or flaw which was supposed to have been made to fix the setting upon the stone. Upon examining this cavity with the microscope, Sir David Brewster observed a yellow light on one part of it. This yellow light was supposed to come from part of the gold being rubbed off. As gold, however, is never yellow by transmitted light, and as gold rubbed off by friction could not possibly be transparent, Sir David had no doubt that the yellow matter was yellow diamond, and that it had originally existed in a fluid state in the cavity. Upon examining next day, along with Mr. Tennant, the collection of diamonds in the British Museum, he saw a remarkable specimen of colourless diamond

on the cleavage surface of which there grew a semi-octohedron of *yellow* diamond. Upon a narrow examination he found in the edge of the specimen a cavity with the extremity of which this yellow diamond was connected, and finding in the other end of the cavity a portion of amorphous yellow diamond, he was led to the conclusion that the semi-octohedron of yellow diamond had existed in a fluid state in the cavity, and having been driven from the cavity, had crystallized upon the cleavage surface. In the paper referred to Sir David remarked that he was aware that such a conclusion made a great demand upon the faith of the mineralogist, but that those who had seen, as he had often seen, cavities of topaz filled with crystals of different properties, some of which were fused by heat and some not,—who had seen these melted crystals again crystallize and recover their former magnitude and shape,—who had seen the fluid contents of cavities boil, and throw up clouds of vapor,—and who had seen the fluid contents of a cavity when opened fall upon the surface of the specimen and change into a regular crystal,—that those who had seen such results would not be unwilling to believe that there might be fluids in the cavities of diamonds capable of exhibiting the same phenomena.

Desirous of gaining more information on this curious subject our author examined nearly fifty diamonds, which were kindly lent to him by Messrs. Hunt and Roskill, and in a vast number of these, or almost all, he found numbers of cavities of the most singular forms, round which the substance of the stone was compressed and altered in the most remarkable manner. The shapes of the cavities sometimes resembled insects and lobsters, and the streaks and patches of colour in polarized light were of the most variegated kind. In examining the hundreds of diamonds which form some of the Oriental ornaments of the East India Company's Museum, our author found that all these stones contained large cavities, and were, in short, coarse and flawed diamonds which could not be cut into brilliants, or used in rings and other ornaments. It seems indeed to be a general truth that there are comparatively few diamonds without cavities and flaws, and that the diamond is a fouler stone than any other used in jewellery. Some diamonds, indeed, derive their *black* colour entirely from the number of cavities which they contain, and which will not permit any light to pass between them. What these cavities contain remains to be discovered. We have now before us a *crystallized* cavity in a specimen sent us by Mr. Sebastian

* See *Athenæum*, September 18th, 1852, p. 1014

Garrard, Jeweller to the Crown, but whatever it does contain is transparent. Berzelius informs us that there is a diamond in the collection of the Countess Porlier, in which, Mr. Parrot says, there is a black mass resembling coal, and which he thinks "is coal which did not become crystallized into the transparent gem;"* but the most remarkable cavity we have heard of is that described by Tavernier in a diamond of 104 carats, which was so foul in the middle that nobody would buy it. "A Hollander, he says, at length bought it, and, cutting it in two, found in the middle of it, *eight carats of filth like a rotten weed!*"

The process of cutting diamonds is one of great interest, and as the facts observed during the cutting of the Koh-i-noor are both new and valuable, we have much pleasure in adding the following communication, for which we are indebted to Mr. Garrard, under whose skilful care and superintendence this important operation has been so well and so safely performed.

"The process of diamond cutting is effected by a horizontal iron plate, of about ten inches in diameter, called a schyf, which revolves from two to three thousand times per minute. The diamond is fixed in a ball of lead which is fitted to an arm, one end of which rests upon the table in which the plate revolves, and the other, at which the ball containing the diamond is fixed, is pressed upon the plate by moveable weights at the discretion of the workman. The weights applied vary, according to the size of the facets intended to be cut, from two to thirty pounds.

"The recutting of the *Koh-i-noor* Diamond was commenced July 16, 1852, by his Grace the late Duke of Wellington, and the part first worked upon was that at which the planes P and F† meet, as it was necessary to reduce the stone at that part to level the set of the stone before the table could be formed, the intention being to turn the stone rather on one side, and to take the incision or flaw at E, and the fracture at M, as the boundaries or sides of the girdle. The next important step taken, was endeavouring to remove an incision or flaw at C, described by Professor Tennant and the Rev. W. Mitchell, as having been made for the purpose of holding the stone more firmly in its setting, but this incision was pronounced by the cutters (after having cut into and examined it) to be a natural flaw of a yellow tinge, a defect often met with in small stones. This statement, if

correct, will prove that that part must have been an original plane of the Octoedron. The next step was cutting a facet on the top of the stone, immediately above the last mentioned flaw: Here the difference in the hardness of the stone first manifested itself, for while cutting this facet the lapidary, noticing that the work did not proceed so fast as before, allowed the diamond to remain on the schyf rather longer than usual, without taking it off to cool: the consequence of this was, that the diamond became so hot from the continued friction and greater weight applied, that it melted the lead in which it was fixed: Again, while cutting the same facet the schyf became so hot from the extreme hardness of the stone, that particles of iron mixed with diamond powder and oil became ignited. The probable cause of the diamond proving so hard at this part is, that the lapidary was obliged to cut directly upon the point or angle at which the two cleavage planes meet, so that he was cutting across the grain of the stone. Another step that was thought to be important by the cutters, was removing a flaw at G. This flaw was not thought to be dangerous by Professor Tennant and the Rev. W. Mitchell, as if it was allowed to run according to the cleavage, it would only take off a small piece, which it was necessary to remove in order to get the present shape. The cutters, however, had an idea that it might not take the desired direction, and therefore began to cut into it from both sides, and afterwards directly upon it, getting rid of it in this manner. While cutting, the stone appeared to get harder and harder the further it was cut into, especially just above the flaw at A, which part became so hard, that after working upon it for six hours, it was found impossible to proceed with the work at the usual speed, the schyf was then revolving at 2400 times a minute. The speed was then increased to 3000 times a minute, when the work gradually proceeded. When the back of the stone (the former top) was cut, it proved to be so soft, that a facet was cut in three hours, that would have occupied more than a day if the stone had been as hard at this part as at the top; the stone got gradually harder afterwards, especially underneath the flaw at A, which part was nearly as hard as that directly above it. An attempt was made to cut out the flaw at A, but it was found not desirable on account of its length. The flaw at N did not at all interfere with the cutting."

We had intended to give some account of the other precious stones of unusual

* Berzelius's *Rapport Annuel*, 1839, p. 297.

† We have left the letters in the text, though we cannot give the diagrams to which they refer.

magnitude and value, such as the *sapphires*, *rubies*, *emeralds*, and *topazes*, which have been preserved in the Royal Repositories of the eastern and western world; but our restricted limits will not permit us, and we shall therefore conclude this article with an explanation of the methods which may be successfully employed in distinguishing the diamond from the precious stones to which it has an outward resemblance, and the artificial pastes or glasses which are made to resemble it; and also the methods of distinguishing all the precious stones from their artificial imitations. These methods are very little known, and very little practised, and we think it discreditable, in an intellectual age like the present, that those who buy and sell and wear the rarest and finest jewels, should scarcely know the simplest rules for determining whether they are buying, selling, or wearing pieces of coloured glass.

When the diamond is rough and uncut it may be distinguished from rough and uncut sapphires, rubies, topazes, cairngorms, amethysts, and quartz, from its giving *vitreous* electricity by friction, while all the others give *resinous* electricity. The diamond, in its octohedral form, is distinguished from the octohedral spinelle, by the former easily scratching the latter. It is distinguished from the sapphire, whether colourless or coloured, by the latter having a specific gravity greater than the former; and it is distinguished from the colourless topaz by the latter giving signs of electricity for several hours after it has been rubbed, whereas the diamond loses its electricity in a quarter of an hour.

These methods are obviously suited only for the mineralogist and the jeweller, who have instruments for the purpose. When the stones are cut and set in gold, another method must be adopted. The *diamond* and the *garnet* are distinguished from all all other precious stones, by their having only *single refraction*, the others having *double refraction*, or giving a *double* image of a taper, or small light, when it is viewed through their facets. By the same means all precious stones, except diamond, and garnet, and spinelle, are distinguished from artificial ones, by the former having double refraction, and the latter only single refraction. Even when the precious stones are set opaque, that is, when we cannot see through them, it is easy to find whether the refraction is single or double, by looking into the stone at the image reflected from the posterior facets. If any of the precious or artificial stones are immersed in alcohol, or even water, they lose their lustre,

while the diamond does not. This arises from their having an inferior refractive, and, consequently, reflecting power, so that the light reflected from their facets is very small compared with that which comes from the diamond. On a modification of this principle Sir David Brewster has constructed an instrument which he calls a *Lithoscope*,* for distinguishing precious stones from one another, and from their imitations. It consists of a small glass prism, which moves round a fixed joint, so that the lower surface of it may be laid upon the surface, or upon a facet, of the stone to be examined. In this position the two surfaces are parallel, and the image reflected from the lower surface of the prism would coincide with that reflected from the surface or facet of the stone. A drop of oil—oil of olives, oil of aniseed, oil of cassia, or sulphuret of carbon, may then, according to circumstances, be placed between the prism and the facet, and when this is done the observer turns a screw, so as to raise the prism a little round its joint. The effect of this is to separate the image of a taper, or a small luminous aperture, as given by the prism, from that given by the facet, and the difference in the intensity and the colour of these two images is an infallible indication of the nature of the stone. In the case of the diamond, with all oils, the image reflected from its facets will be many more times brighter than the image reflected from the face of the prism,† than with any other of the precious stones.

In perusing the preceding pages the reader cannot fail to have been struck with the singular nature of the substance to which his attention has been called. In all its characters and relations the diamond occupies a peculiar and a lofty place. It is the monarch of the subterranean world:—the material divinity which the Pagan, the Jew, and the Christian worship with equal idolatry. The *saera fames auri*, the accursed thirst for gold, is an inferior and less exciting passion than that with which we would struggle for the gigantic brilliant, or scramble for its glittering fragments. Over this globe of ours there rules many a mighty

* From *λίθος*, a stone, and *σκοπεω*, to see. This instrument as made by Dolland, was exhibited to the British Association at York in 1832. See *First Report*, &c., p. 78.

† A well known though generally ill-practised method of distinguishing precious from artificial stones, is to touch them with the tongue. The stone being the best conductor of heat, will feel cold, and the glass much less so. The two should, previous to the experiment, be placed close to each other, till they have acquired the same temperature.

sovereign—on its surface are many rich and powerful empires—many a cloud capt tower and gorgeous palace rises above its plains—many a mass of gold and of silver has been wrenched from its bowels—and many a gem of art has arrested the intellectual eye;—but more loved than Sovereigns—more prized than empires—more coveted than gold—more admired than the creations of Raphael, is the sparkling diamond which flashes in the imperial crown or adorns the royal sceptre, or adds to beauty its only "foreign aid." Nor is this an ideal appreciation of its rarity and worth. It is in truth the very essence of property. It is riches condensed and wealth secured—too small to be seen by the midnight burglar—too easily hid to be seized by the tyrant—and too quickly carried away to be wrested from the patriot exile, or torn from the hunted outlaw. In vain would the vanquished monarch strive to remove his bags of gold, or transport his territorial domains;—but a diamond is an empire made portable, with which he might purchase a better kingdom and mount a prouder throne. Had the treasury of Cræsus been invested in brilliants he might have founded a nobler Lydia beyond the reach of his Persian invader.

It is difficult to express in words or in numbers the commercial value of the Diamond; but we may truly say that a string of Koh-i-noors, a furlong in length, would purchase the fee-simple of the globe, while a ring engirdling the Arctic Zone would buy up the whole planetary system.

A moral as well as a secular lesson is read to us by the diamond. Like every organism of this world it bears the impress of decay. The stoutest metal and the toughest gem exist by forces which time weakens and the elements destroy; and in that great catastrophe when the "Earth and the works which are therein shall be burned up," the jewel so highly prized will pass into its primeval cinder, while the silver and the gold will only change their form, and reappear perchance brighter and purer in the new earth which is to arise. Let us covet then the virgin gold and the pure silver of truth and justice, and estimate at their real value the glittering qualities and the dazzling possessions which bear so high a value in this world, but which have none in the next.

ART. VII.—1. *Uncle Tom's Cabin, or Life among the Lowly.* By HARRIET BEECHER STOWE. Boston, 1852.

2. *Aunt Phillis's Cabin, or Southern Life as it is.* By MRS. EASTMAN.

3. *Slavery in the Southern States.* By a CAROLINIAN.*

THE ordinary office of a Review is to introduce a book to the notice of its readers. But no such task is ours in the present instance. The question asked with respect to "*Uncle Tom's Cabin*" is not "have you read it?" but "what do you think of it?" It is already the book of two hemispheres. The number of its readers is one of the chief literary and social phenomena of the age. Within a few months it has been more than twenty times reprinted. It has spread in hundreds of thousands on both sides of the Atlantic, and has occupied the minds and tongues of men more than any other book of our time. Ordinary criticism has here for the present no place. We covet not the office of criticising a picture before which all that have eyes and hearts are still standing breathless as before the living reality. We deem it idle to tell of the author's powers of pathos to those whose eyes are yet moist with the tears it has called forth—to speak of mastery over human passions, to those whose hearts are still in turn shuddering with horror, glowing with indignation, and melting with pity. It is not for us to wield our critic-rod even but as a divining-rod, to point to where treasures lie; and gladly do we lay it down at the feet of the gifted authoress, whose highest praise it is that we lose the recollection of the genius that has produced this book, in the intense power of its truth, appealing to every human heart and conscience. We hail it as the noble work of a noble woman in a noble cause. And as a woman's work, we hail it, not merely admiringly, but hopefully, as a bright omen of the speedy triumph of this noble cause. We remember that it was a woman, Elizabeth Heyrick, who wrote the pamphlet that moved the heart of Wilberforce, to pity, and to pray over, the wrongs of the oppressed sons of Africa, and sent him forth to his life-long struggle on their behalf. We bid this true-hearted woman accept the omen of his success.

One mark of genius displayed in Mrs. Stowe's work it may be worth while to notice, because many of her readers are likely to have overlooked it, though feeling its effects. A work of fiction, read with more

*Published in *Fraser's Magazine*, October 1852.

intense and more widely-spread interest than any this age has seen, is destitute of that which is the ordinary resource of writers of fiction—the adventures of *two lovers*. The omission of this is what hardly any writer of fiction, bad or good, has ever ventured on since Shakspeare, with the single exception of Defoe. Not even Sir Walter Scott, nor even Miss Austen, could venture on this omission. But it is to be found in two of the most powerfully interesting works that ever were produced—ROBINSON CRUSOE and UNCLE TOM.

But, as we have said, our object is not to furnish a literary criticism of this extraordinary book. We turn to the hideous social malady which roused the genius of its author, to compare with these awful pictures which all the civilized world has been studying for months past in a work of fiction, some specimens selected at random from the mass of plain but authentic documents now in our possession, illustrating the reception of her book in America, and more generally slave life, and the social position of the slaves in that country. Here we find ourselves so overloaded, that our chief trouble and grief is caused not by the difficulty of finding facts, but by the impossibility of finding a place in our pages for more than a few small fragments of the evidence which has been recently placed in our possession.

A preliminary word on the charge of partisanship which some have alleged against Mrs. Stowe. Amid all the horrors of her tale, and the anguish she keeps alive in every reader, she has taught us to feel deep sympathy with a class of slaveholders of whom, in her St. Clare and Mrs. Shelby, she has furnished us with types. Canning is reported to have said that "to depend upon the honour of another is to depend upon his will; and to depend upon the will of another is to be a slave." Now, while Mrs. Stowe has shown that circumstances uncontrollable by the slave-owner must render his honour no security at all to the slave, from any extremes of evil possible under the system, yet none can read her book without saying, "there is honour among slaveholders." She has fully recognised what we know to be a fact—the existence of many slave-owners in the South States who care for and take pains to promote the welfare of their slaves—who would choose to be the victims rather than the inflictors of the cruelties she has laid bare. We know that there are many to whose high moral natures the system of slavery is an overwhelming burden—who having received it as a heri-

tage from their fathers, feel it to be a heritage of woe, and are ready to say "the fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." Mrs. Stowe has taught us generous sympathy for these men, while she has revealed to us the uncontrollable necessities of a system which is an incubus on the moral energies of the western world, and deliverance from which is become a matter of life and death. Her book leaves the conviction that the evil lies in the essence of the system and not in its accidents. She illustrates the manner in which the most frightful sufferings naturally issue out of the most favourable circumstances in which slavery can exist. The dramatic power of the work is not more remarkable than the moderation, large views, and excellent sense of the writer.

Amid all the tributes to this appeal of Mrs. Stowe to every human feeling and every christian principle, there is, perhaps, no greater tribute to its power than the kind and multitude of answers that have issued, and are still issuing, from the upholders and abettors of the slave-system, of whose horrors this tremendous revelation has been made. We have said that the power of the book lies in its truth, directed to the consciences of men—and, accordingly, we find that the consciences of men are dealing with it as truth. And perhaps it is in its being an appeal to conscience, and in its being responded to as such, that the book stands out from the class to which it nominally belongs. When did an army of journalists, and novelists, and pamphleteers—in fact, all the legal organs of society, ever before so set themselves in battle-array to contend against the truth of a so-called "work of fiction?" When, before, were so many pens employed to refute the "wild and unreal pictures"—the "monstrous exaggerations"—the "abominable libels"—to repel the "calumny and insult" of a novel? But the fact is, that Mrs. Stowe has told the truth fearlessly; and therefore is she not only answered, but answered wrathfully; and should these answers not teach us to doubt her statements, they will, at least, teach us to estimate the degree of moral courage, the power of christian principle, required to enable her to speak the truth in America.

We shall first give our readers a specimen of the many answers to Mrs. Stowe, which we think may assist them to decide whether her assailants give more honourable testimony to the character of Southern slaveholders than she herself does. We give the following article at full length:—

(From the *Weekly Picayune*, New Orleans,
August 30, 1852.)
"UNCLE TOM."

"It is stated in Eastern papers that an experienced writer in Boston is engaged in dramatizing the abolition novel, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and that it is about to be produced upon the stage in that city. The gross misrepresentations of the south, which have been propagated so extensively through the press, with the laudations of editors, politicians, and pious fanatics of the pulpit, are to be presented in tableaux, and the lies they contain acted by living libellers, before crowds of deluded spectators. The stage is to be employed in depicting to the people of the north the whole body of the people of the south, as living in a state of profligacy, cruelty, and crime—tyrants, who fear not God, and cruelly oppress their fellow-creatures; and the drama is thus enlisted among the promoters of sectional hatred, a teacher and preacher of national discord, whose end inevitably would be the disruption of the Union. How long is it supposed that political harmony can subsist, after the alienation of feeling shall have been fully established which this organized system of misrepresentation and insult, on one side, and the natural instincts of resentment and retaliation on the other, must create? What better materials can be found for mutual hatred and perpetual warfare? How long would men consent to live together on such terms; and from a severed Union, what else can follow but open and unappeasable hostilities, more real and more insatiate than those which, for hundreds of years, made France and England, divided only by a narrow firth, look on each other as natural enemies; and every individual Englishman think of a Frenchman as something he was bound to hate and destroy? The tendency of all the anti-slavery demonstrations in the north—abolition novels, abolition lectures, pictorial abolitionism, and now the abuse of the stage to the purposes of calumny and insult, in aid of abolitionism—is to create a more intense international enmity, than could ever rage between nations of different languages and institutions. There are no feuds so deadly as those of disunited families; no enemies so remorseless as brothers who have once torn asunder all the ties and charities of kindred blood.

"It is with a shuddering thought of these consequences, which the folly and cupidity of the times will not see, that we read of the popularity, at the north, of such books as 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' and the attempts to give it a more effective form, by presenting it on the stage, fixing it with all the arts of scenery, on the memory of thousands who do not read, as a true picture of life and morals at the south; bringing up a new generation with the ineradicable idea that there is in one-half the territory of the United States, a people to whom the monstrous inhumanities and shameless corruptions described with so much deplorable art by this authoress, are familiar and welcome as their daily food. The success of the attempt must be a dreadful calamity, the source of innumerable horrors to both sections and both races; and even if it should not prove to be successful, the attempt itself is a great crime, merit-

ing universal abhorrence. It is deplorable that a woman should be the chief instrument in this labour of mischief. We know nothing of Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, except from her book; but there is enough in that to give her an odious notoriety. She has too much mind not to comprehend the wicked injustice and dangerous consequences of the distorted picture she has drawn of slave-life and southern morals. She knows that a picture of northern society, in which the Polly Bodines, the Ann Hoggss, and John W. Websters, were portrayed as true representatives of the principles and habits of New York or Massachusetts, would be as correct in material facts, as her story of planting life in the south; and she would no doubt feel an inexpressible disgust for the yellow bound literature which should circulate such abominations.

"But her own task has been not a particle more honourable, nay, her work ought to be ranked below those in its moral purpose, and herself rebuked with sterner severity; because she has degraded to her unseemly and mischievous labours powers which might have been usefully and gracefully devoted to delicate and womanly compositions. The secret of this voluntary debasement is, we fear, to be found in a calculation of profit most cordially masculine, in the misusing of her thoughts for the sake of gain. The dollars with which she has been enabled to make herself rich, to buy that snug country place, and seat herself down for a life of luxurious leisure, had more attractions for her than the love of truth, or the natural feminine instincts for peace. Hence she dipped her pen in the bitterest gall of malevolence, and has written one of the most abominable libels which the age has produced, full of all manner of calumnies and uncharitableness; and provocative of mischief beyond her power to check, if she would. Such a desecration of woman's nature is a sorry and a rare sight, even in this age of feminine aspirations to rivalry with man in all his harshest of traits, and all his most unamiable pursuits."

Now assuredly the writer of such a paragraph as the above leaves little doubt that he is very angry. He does not pretend to any philosophic indifference to unjust accusation, still less to the calm dignity of christian patience under calumny. He does not say, "Let the galled jade wince, my withers are unwrung." No, he honestly says, "We have galls, and though we have some grace, yet have we some revenge." He *is* angry, and he lets us see it. Not only to Mrs. Stowe herself does he attribute heartless cruelty, shameless falsehood, and gross cupidity, but also to all those aiding her efforts, or even giving credit to her statements; and, according to him, the number is very great. In justice to him, we are bound to mention that a similar testimony is borne to the character of a large proportion of the "Northerners" by the author of "Aunt Phillis's Cabin," another of the answers to "Uncle Tom." Now, sup-

posing this to be true, or half true, it follows that in about half of the United States, there are very many persons mercenary, unjust, reckless, passionate, cruel, and merciless; and we are naturally led to inquire which of these qualities render the persons in whom they are displayed, fit to have *uncontrolled power* over their fellow-men? And if it be established that in the *North-ern* States there is a considerable proportion of persons unfit to be entrusted with *uncontrolled power*, what warrant have we that it is not the same in the *South*? what reason have we to believe that the "Southerners" are universally mild, humane, conscientious, and considerate? We cannot find a reason in the difference of race, for they are, on the whole, the same race; nor can we suppose a few degrees of latitude can make so great a difference of character. Where then can we find any reason to trust the "Southerners" while distrusting the "Northerners," unless, indeed, we are to believe that the *non-existence of slavery* can corrupt the morals of a people, or its *existence* confer and promote moral elevation?

On the whole, we think we have reason to congratulate Mrs. Stowe on having at least a candid opponent in the editor of the *New Orleans paper*. Not only by not attempting to deny does he admit the *possibility* of the occurrence of these "outrageous inhumanities," and "shameless corruptions described with so much deplorable art," but he furnishes us in the very same paper with an instance of their actual occurrence. We copy the paragraph:—

"*Outrageous Cruelty—Quick Retribution.*—The *Memphis Eagle* states that, some time since, one Matthew Rayner, who resides in the vicinity of Raleigh, Tenn., had one of his negro men to run away. He apprehended him in Memphis, and took him home. The next day he commenced a cruel and fiend-like punishment, and, after inflicting upon him hundreds of lashes, concluded by cutting off both of the negro's ears close to his head. The shocking facts spread through the neighbourhood, and news was *some way* conveyed to Rayner that a warrant had been issued for his apprehension. Upon hearing this he immediately left the county, and arrived at the residence of a Mr. Beard, in Tipton county, where he died the next day, and was buried at his residence on the 10th instant."

There, certainly, is here strong expression of very natural horror; and yet we cannot but suspect that it is the *cropping off the man's ears* that has excited it, from his expectation that legal punishment was to follow the deed. For it is certain that this would not have been entailed by any amount

of mere *flogging*. Indeed, how could it? Unless every slave against whom his master had any complaint, were brought before a magistrate, who should allot the due amount, and also see it inflicted? But this would involve the master's passing his whole life before the tribunal: and therefore, with all due regard for his valuable time, and to the claims of justice for immediate satisfaction, by the laws of South Carolina and Louisiana, a discretionary power is given to the master himself to punish his slaves "by whipping or beating with a horse-whip, cow-skin switch, or stick, or by ironing or impressing."^{*}

But though the paragraph states that the legal authorities did take cognizance of this crime so far as to issue a warrant for the arrest of its perpetrator, with a view, it is to be presumed, to bring him to trial; yet we cannot be sure what the result might have been, or whether punishment would have been inflicted. And our doubt will not appear irrational when it is remembered that this occurrence took place in Memphis, a town in the State of Tennessee, whose slave-code actually contains a provision that makes the penalty of false witness to be "*a cropping*" of both ears, with an exposure of the negro in the pillory for two hours, each ear being successively nailed to it for one hour, and then cut off.[†]

But we have other testimony besides that furnished by the indignation or the alarm of this New Orleans exponent of the minds of the Southern slaveholders, to the truthfulness of Mrs. Stowe's representations of the realities of slave-life; we have ourselves obtained the strong testimony of a distinguished author, a Barbadian by birth, and who has himself owned slaves. He says, (in a letter to a friend,) "The picture of American slavery in *Uncle Tom* is not the less faithful because a stranger visiting the country sees so little of it; and because the *general* conduct of slave-owners may be humane. The worst cases no one sees. Slavery was mitigated in our West Indian Colonies by the small size of the islands, and the check of public opinion which reaches every corner. But in the remote districts of America, and even of Jamaica, what may and must have taken place when every master was a law to himself?"

And this last fact enables us to reconcile the contradictory reports which present the condition of the slave in such totally different aspects. "Every master is a law to

^{*} Laws of Carolina. Brevard's Digest. Slaves, 543. And Digest of Louisiana. Code Noir, sect. Crimes and Punishments. Sect. 16, vol. i.

[†] Statute Law of Tennessee, vol. i. Slaves, p. 313.

himself," and according as he is humane and generous, or selfish and cruel, controlled or uncontrolled, by the external circumstances in which he is placed, so does he deal with his slaves. A friend of ours told us that he was once staying in a house where a lady who was visiting rebuked him for saying something against slavery, asking whether he had ever been in the West Indies. He said "No, but that he was intimate with many West Indians." She replied, that he could not be any judge. She had spent six weeks in Jamaica with her friend Mr. Smith, or Mr. Jones, and she could testify that the slaves were well treated, and very happy, and far better off than the poor of this country. The lady of the house, who had much sly humour, observed to her, "Your friend Mr. Smith was a *remarkably* kind-hearted, good man, was he not?" "Oh, yes, most *singularly* so." Her auditors exchanged glances, but left her contented with her supposed proof.

Such was the good lady's report, and we doubt not there are many similar instances. But we are obliged to present another and not quite so pleasing picture of the negro's *happiness*, under the beneficent rule of the absolute owner of the negro, "body and soul." This picture of human life under a slave system is drawn from informations sworn before the House of Commons, on occasion of the inquiry into the state of the West Indian Colonies. We would gladly spare our readers and ourselves the disgusting details of facts which, taken from legal documents, exhibit as cruel an infliction of *physical suffering* as do those statements of Mrs. Stowe, which her milder assailants characterize as "gross exaggerations," as "a most wild and unreal picture of slavery," as "imaginative sketches," as "well-seasoned horrors." It is matter of fact, that in the island of Tortola, on one plantation, during a period of three years, *sixty* negroes died from severity of punishment, and for that whole time but *one* negro died a natural death. Children of nine years old were taken up by the heels and dipped into tubs of water with their heads downward, kept there till stifled, then taken out and suffered to recover breath, when they were again treated in the same manner, and afterwards suspended from a tree with the hands tied together, and cart-whipped. In one case a child, about ten years of age, died with its skin almost entirely off. It had been dipped, by its master's order, into a caldron of boiling liquor. Three women suspected of an attempt to poison their mistress, had a quantity of boiling water poured down their throats, and after being severely cart-

whipped, were sent chained together and in a state of entire nakedness to work in the fields. But we pause. There are other parts of this *Aceldama* upon which we dare not enter. Could it be credible by any one unacquainted with the baleful influence of this system upon all who breathe its atmosphere, that this wretch was regarded by the people around him as a "gentleman that had a 'comical way' with his negroes, but was in the main a good man."

The late Sir Charles Wale, when governor of an island taken from the French, set himself to devise plans (which were put a stop to by the cession of the island to France) for mitigating the horrors of slavery. One of the instances which came under his notice (we speak on the best authority, and are prepared to verify the facts by indubitable proofs) was that of a negro who had been suspended by the arms for several weeks, until he had so completely lost the use of them, that he was ever after obliged, unless some one fed him like an infant, to take his food like a dog by putting down his mouth to it.

But it may be said further, that the particular cases we have mentioned happened many years ago, and in an obscure island of the West Indies. We will call another witness to bear his testimony to the state of things at this day in New Orleans. That witness is Dr. Howe, the friend and instructor of Laura Bridgman.* In a letter from him to Mr. Charles Sumner, which we have read, he thus bears the testimony of an eye-witness against slavery:—

"I have passed ten days in New Orleans, not unprofitably, I trust, in examining the public institutions—the schools, asylums, hospitals, prisons, &c. With the exception of the first there is little hope of amelioration. I know not how much merit there may be in their system, but I do know that, in the administration of the penal code, there are abominations which should bring down the fate of Sodom upon the city.

"If Howard or Mrs. Fry ever discovered so ill administered a den of thieves as the New Orleans prison, they never described it. In the negro's apartment I saw much which made me blush that I was a white man, and which for a moment stirred up an evil spirit in my animal nature. Entering a large paved court-yard, around which ran galleries filled with slaves of all ages, sexes, and colours, I heard the snap of a whip, every stroke of which sounded like the sharp crack of a pistol. I turned my head, and beheld a sight which absolutely chilled me to the marrow of my bones, and gave me, for the first time in my life, the sensation of my hair stiffening at the roots. There lay a black girl flat upon her face on a board, her two thumbs tied, and fas-

* Mentioned in Archbishop Whately's *Elements of Logic*, (note, pp. 19, 20, 9th edition.)

tened to one end, her feet tied and drawn tightly to the other end, while a strap passed over the small of her back, and fastened around the board, compressed her closely to it. Below the strap she was entirely naked. By her side, and six feet off, stood a huge negro, with a long whip, which he applied with dreadful power and wonderful precision. Every stroke brought away a strip of skin, which clung to the lash, or fell quivering on the pavement, while the blood followed after it. The poor creature writhed and shrieked, and in a voice which showed alike her fear of death and her dreadful agony, screamed to her master, who stood at her head, "Oh, spare my life; don't cut my soul out!" But still fell the horrid lash; still strip after strip peeled off from the skin; gash after gash was cut in her living flesh, until it became a livid and bloody mass of raw and quivering muscle.

"It was with the greatest difficulty I refrained from springing upon the torturer, and arresting his lash; but alas, what could I do, but turn aside to hide my tears for the sufferer, and my blushes for humanity!"

"This was in a public and regularly organized prison; the punishment was one recognised and authorized by the law. But think you the poor wretch had committed a heinous offence, and had been convicted thereof, and sentenced to the lash? Not at all! She was brought by her master to be whipped by the common executioner, without trial, judge, or jury, just at his beck or nod, for some real or supposed offence, or to gratify his own whim or malice. And he may bring her day after day, without cause assigned, and inflict any number of lashes he pleases, short of twenty-five, provided only he pays the fee. Or if he choose, he may have a private whipping-board on his own premises, and brutalize himself there.

"A shocking part of this horrid punishment was its publicity, as I have said; it was in a court-yard, surrounded by galleries, which were filled with coloured persons of all sexes—run-away slaves committed for some crime, or slaves up for sale. You would naturally suppose they crowded forward and gazed horror-stricken at the brutal spectacle below; but they did not; many of them hardly noticed it, and many were entirely indifferent to it. They went on in their childish pursuits, and some were laughing outright in the distant parts of the galleries;—so low can man created in God's image be sunk in brutality."

And now, has Mrs. Stowe exaggerated? Do the colours of her "most wild and unreal picture"—"the phantoms of a prurient imagination" fade before the light of sober reality? The heart shudders and the nerves quiver as we read her tale of torture and of death; but, in the actual working of the system itself, there are deeper horrors which she has *not* unrolled, on that scroll like unto the Prophet's, "written within and without, lamentations, and mourning, and woe." Hear her own words. We have ourselves been favoured with the sight of a letter from her, and we give the heart-words of

this true-hearted woman. She is speaking of her book:—"There has been hardly a day since it has been published that confirmatory voices have not come from southern slaveholders; men who have long waited for an opportunity to speak, and who now come out to attest its truth—for, alas! they know what I know, and they must perceive that I know it, that the half is not told in that book. A book that should tell all would not be credited—it *could not be read*.

I have only wondered some moments, in the anguish of the survey, that the firm earth does not collapse to hide such horror from the sun!"

But now assuming that no single instance could be proved of wrong suffered from this entire dependence of many men upon the arbitrary will of one man—and this absolute dependence is the essence of slavery—this surely could be no ground for the defence of a system under which there could be a *possibility*, not merely of its occurring, but of its occurring without violating one essential principle of that system. "Nephew," said Algernon Sydney in prison on the night before his execution, "I value not my own life a chip; but what concerns me is that *the law* which takes away my life, *may* hang every one of you whenever it is thought convenient."

But even supposing the *system* were such as to be quite unexceptionable, when well administered, and that nothing but its *abuses* were ever deserving of censure,—are the citizens of the United States prepared to pass a verdict of acquittal in *all* cases, and on every kind of system, on such grounds? Are they prepared, for instance, to substitute for their boasted republican institutions an absolute monarchy? Yet it is plain that a perfectly wise and good monarch would devote himself to the welfare of his people, and would most effectually promote it. And if so *many hundred thousands* of their slave-owners are thus qualified, (which they must be, to insure the good treatment of the slaves,) it would not be difficult for them to select *one* who should be thus qualified, and make him their autocrat. As for the atrocious cruelties of a Nero or a Domitian, they do not belong to the "institution itself;" they are only the *abuses* of it.

True it is that we ought to distinguish between the legitimate purpose—the intrinsic character—of any system, and its abuses. But to put out of account altogether the greater or less liability to abuses, and the greater or less enormity of them; and quietly to ignore every *incidental* evil, would be, in the ordinary concerns of life, regarded as proof of insanity. Who, for instance,

would leave children at play in a room full of loaded fire-arms, and edge-tools, and open casks of gunpowder? Yet the tools were not *designed* to cut them, or the guns to shoot them. If they maim, kill, or blow up one another, these are only *abuses*. But what American, North or South, would like to be himself exposed to the risk of such abuses as, by their own shewing, slavery is liable to?

A writer in a late number of "The Times," finds security and protection for the slaves against the neglect, the recklessness, the violence, and the cruelty of their owners, in the principle of self-interest—because ill-treatment of them would impair their value. But does self-interest, we ask, avail to secure from man's neglect, or his violence, or his cruelty, the *brute* animals that are his property? Surely, we need only point to the daily police-reports, to find abundant evidence that, in the case of brute property, legal interposition is necessary to protect the horse, the donkey, the cattle, from him who on the ground of self-interest is the most concerned in their wellbeing. Why, then, should self-interest suffice to guard the negro from the passions and cruelty of an owner, in whose eye he ranks not higher than his cattle? And what is the rage of a passionate man against a *brute*, compared with what is felt against a fellow *man*?

The following advertisement, copied verbatim by Sir Charles Lyell from a Natchez paper, illustrates the spirit and manner in which human "chattels" are disposed of in America in the intercourse of commerce:—

"NINETY NEGROES FOR SALE.

"I have about ninety negroes just arrived from Richmond, Virginia, field hands, horse-servants, carriage-drivers, two sempstresses, several very fine cooks, (females,) and one very fine cook, (male.) One black-smith, one carpenter, and some excellent mules, and excellent waggons and harness, and one very fine riding horse—all of which I will sell at the most reasonable prices. I have made arrangements in Richmond, Va., to have regular shipments every month, and intend to keep a good stock on hand of every description of servants during the season.

"Natchez, October 16th. JOHN D. JAMES."

And in a St. Louis paper, the following passage occurs in the account of a steam-boat collision:—

"We learn that the passengers lost all their effects; one gentleman in particular lost nine negroes and fourteen horses."

The law of South Carolina expressly declares—"Slaves shall be deemed, taken,

reputed, and adjudged, to be *chattels personal* in the hands of their masters and possessors to all intents and purposes whatever." There is, moreover, a plain admission on the part of the Slave States Legislature, that there is nothing that can be inflicted on a man, in this life, worse than slavery, in the fact that the punishment affixed to crimes committed by the slaves, is always *death*. Cases of arson, theft, and burglary, which would be comparatively lightly dealt with, if committed by white men, are all death, to the slave. But the legislature could not do otherwise, and this necessity is strongly stated in the following extract from "The Cincinnati Herald":—

"A negro has committed a crime, is convicted and brought for sentence, and the question arises, what shall that sentence be? Shall he be fined? No, for we have already robbed him of all his property,—not a penny left which he can call his own. A fine, therefore, is out of the question. Shall we deprive him of liberty? We have done that already. We have completely stripped him of every right; we have sacrificed them to our avarice. We cannot take away that which he has not; and imprisonment to him would be a sweet pastime, a relief from the burning sun of the field, a source of real enjoyment. We cannot *punish* him by imprisonment; the dungeon would be a solace, a reward. We might separate him from his wife and children, and cause him to suffer thus as a punishment. No wife and children he has; they were sold away from him long ago. His children are torn from each other, and the mother from children and husband both. We cannot make him feel again on that point. The wound was made, but the agony is over now, and the medicine was a despair, which palsied the heart beyond all power of feeling again. Shall we load him with chains? No, the marks on his wrists and ankles show yet, now raw and bloody, where the fetters were, when he was manacled *without* a crime, when he was chained in the gang, to be *driven* as a brute. There is no *punishment* in chains for him. Can we not scourge him? No, look at his back, fresh torn as it is with the lash. Scourging and torture are a familiar part of daily life with him. Everything but life has already, and often, been drained by the overseer's scourge; and scourging, therefore, would scarcely rise in his judgment to the dignity of a judicial infliction, and would produce very little *moral* effect.

"We might thrust him out of the pale of humanity, and pursue him and hunt him down as we would a beast of prey. That has been done already, more than once, and such incidents are familiar to him, and would present none of the terrors of novelty. That long scar on his cheek was where the bloodhound tore him; and that red line along his head was ploughed by a rifle-shot from his pursuing master. He has been *hunted* already. What then can be done with one whose common life, whose daily experience, is so horrible, that legal ingenuity and power, panting for revenge, can de-

wise nothing worse than what is already upon him! One thing only remains, as the editor of the *Herald* has said,—*He can be killed.* Everything but death he suffers now. *Let him be killed!*"

Such, then, is the light in which the slave is regarded by the slaveholder, by the laws of the country, and by a large proportion of its inhabitants. But still worse than this is the light in which the poor negro considers himself. And surely the worst feature of slavery after all, is that *conscious degradation of the man*, which is inseparable from his contented acquiescence in being a "chattel." Nor has Mrs. Stowe, in her admirable delineation of the negro character, omitted some happy touches in reference to this point. Eva is pleading with Topsy:

"What does make you so bad, Topsy? Why won't you try and be good? Don't you love *anybody*, Topsy?"

"Donno know nothing 'bout love; I loves candy and sich, that's all," said Topsy.

"But you love your father and mother?"

"Never had none, ye know. I telled ye that, Miss Eva."

"Oh, I know," said Eva, sadly; "but hadn't you any brother, or sister, or aunt, or—"

"No, none on 'em—never had nothing nor nobody."

"But Topsy, if you'd only try to be good, you might—"

"Couldn't never be nothin' but a nigger, if I was ever so good," said Topsy. "If I could be skinned, and come white, I'd try then."

"But people can love you if you are black, Topsy. Miss Ophelia would love you if you were good."

"Topsy gave the short blunt laugh that was her common mode of expressing incredulity."

"Do not you think so?" said Eva.

"No, she can't bar me, 'cause I'm a nigger! She'd's soon have a toad touch her. There can't nobody love niggers, and niggers can't do nothin'. I don't care," said Topsy, beginning to whistle.

"O Topsy, poor child, I love you!" said Eva, with a sudden burst of feeling—and laying her little thin, white hand on Topsy's shoulder—"I love you, because you haven't had any father, or mother, or friends; because you've been a poor abused child! I love you, and I want you to be good. I am very unwell, Topsy, and I think I shan't live a great while; and it really grieves me, to have you be so naughty. I wish you would try to be good for my sake;—it's only a little while I shall be with you."

"The round keen eyes of the black child were overcast with tears; large bright drops rolled heavily down, one by one, and fell on the little white hand. Yes, in that moment a ray of real belief, a ray of heavenly love, had penetrated the darkness of her heathen soul! She laid her head down between her knees, and wept and sobbed! while the beautiful child, bending over her, looked like the picture of some bright angel stooping to reclaim a sinner."

"Poor Topsy!" said Eva. "Don't you know

that Jesus loves all alike? He is just as willing to love you as me. He loves you just as I do,—only more, because he is better. He will help you to be good, and you can go to heaven at last, and be an angel for ever, just as much as if you were white. Only think of it, Topsy! You can be one of those spirits bright Uncle Tom sings about."

"Oh dear Miss Eva, dear Miss Eva!" said the child, "I will try, I will try! I never did care nothin' about it before."

"St. Clare at this instant dropped the curtain. 'It puts me in mind of mother,' he said to Miss Ophelia. 'It is true what she told me; if we want to give sight to the blind, we must be willing to do as Christ did—call them to us, and put our hands on them.'"

A similar consciousness of inferiority is apparent in some of Aunt Chloe's little speeches. It was not in keeping with Mrs. Stowe's object to make it more prominent.

But still we are told on every side that the slaves are the happiest people in the world. The New Orleans paper says so, and Mrs. Eastman says so, and, indeed, almost every Anti-Abolitionist says so.* Slaves, we are told, *like* slavery. And if this be meant to apply only to individual instances, we are ready to admit it to be true. But if it be meant to assert that such is the case universally, or even generally, we feel bound, before we can give our assent to the proposition, to make a few inquiries. What is the meaning of the countless advertisements, offering rewards for the apprehension of runaway slaves, to be recognised by marks sufficient to prove the "happy" state they left, and which they were too dull or too ungrateful to appreciate? What is the meaning of certain legal provisions and enactments in the slave code of the States? Surely those legislators could not have been so fully impressed with this contentment with, not to say, preference for slavery, when they penned such enactments as that of Mississippi, which declares that "any

* The application of the word "happy" to slaves, suggests a circumstance related by Clarkson, the Negro's Friend. It occurred during the course of the Parliamentary Inquiry, previous to the passing of Sir William Dolben's bill, brought in with a view to lessen the horrors of the middle passage, by limiting the number of the slave cargo in proportion to the tonnage of the vessel. The evidence offered by the opponents of the measure was wound up by the statement that this voyage was one of the *happiest periods* of the niggers' lives, and it was given as a proof that, when upon the deck, they were in the habit of amusing themselves by dancing. But, when the witnesses came to be cross-examined, what description did they give of the dancing? The negroes, who usually lay chained two and two by the hands and feet, and heavily ironed, were made, after meals, to *jump for exercise*, deemed so necessary to their health that they were whipped if they refused to do it, and this jumping was what the witnesses called "*dancing*."

person finding a fugitive negro, may seize, apprehend, and whip him on the spot—that any negro travelling without a pass is liable to be seized and put into jail—that the jailer shall interrogate the prisoners, and write by mail to the person by them described as master; if the account be false, he shall give each prisoner twenty-five lashes—well laid on," and "interrogate them anew," &c.; and for the space of six months it shall be his duty "alternately to interrogate and whip as aforesaid." What is the meaning of that law of South Carolina,* declaring death to be the punishment not only of the runaway slave, but of any person who shall choose to aid him in his escape? Or of that of Louisiana,† declaring it lawful to "fire upon any slaves who do not stop when pursued? Or of that of Tennessee, declaring it lawful for any person whatsoever, and by such ways or means as he or she (and it is such as these that charge Mrs. Stowe with being unfeminine) shall think fit to put to death any fugitive slave?"‡

Why is it that there is not anything like an admission of this love of slavery in the negro throughout the whole *legislative* code of the system, unless he find it in the enactment which, in the laws of Louisiana and Tennessee, provides for the gratification of this very natural desire for restoration to his cherished bondage, by ordering that if unreclaimed by the master, from whom he has escaped, he should be sold, or in that other of those morally elevating edicts, which decrees rewards to any citizen who shall apprehend the runaway? What is the meaning of the provision of the constitution of Mississippi?—"The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves, without the consent of their owners, *unless when the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service.*"|| Who can reconcile freedom being there offered as a fit reward for distinguished service rendered to the State, with the continual assertions that the slaves would not accept freedom if offered to them? We think we shall scarcely be accused of pressing our argument too far, when we assert that we have been furnished with abundant proof, not only that the love of slavery is neither inherent in the negro, nor universally acquired by him, but that it is not considered to be so by the *legislators* for this "Domestic Institution."

This pretence, that slaves love slavery,

that they are but coquetting with it, and want only to have a little gentle violence used, is like the Irish vindication in each case of the common crime of abduction,— "The girl wished in her heart to be carried off, and only wanted an excuse to give her father and mother." Thus, too, the French, when invading Rome, urged that the Romans in their hearts wished for the overthrow of the Republic, but were overawed by bandits, and were glad of the coercion. If true, these statements only prove the consummated moral ruin of the victims of the system.

But perhaps we might be better able to form some conception of this "happiness," if we could clearly understand the meaning of an expression which seems a favorite one with the Carolinian, whose letter, in vindication of the slaveholders and Southern slavery, has just appeared in *Fraser's Magazine*. It professes to be an answer on the part of the southern slaveholders to the question, "What do you think of Uncle Tom's Cabin?" In this pamphlet the writer speaks more than once of the "*vis medicatrix* of nature correcting the insufficiencies of legislation." Truly such "insufficiencies" must be intended as Montesquieu thus describes,— "La loi de l'esclavage n'a jamais pu être utile à l'esclave; elle est dans tous les cas *contre* lui sans *jamais* être *pour* lui: ce qui est contraire au principe fondamental de toutes les sociétés."

According to Montesquieu, there is not merely inadequate provision but adverse power. But to correct these "insufficiencies of law," the "*vis medicatrix* of nature" comes in, according to the Carolinian. He had better have said that the law of the slave system comes in to correct nature—that is after the fashion of a slaveholder's correction—to trample upon it and to crush it. And he might have added that it was necessary to the very existence of slavery that law *should* come in to defend and maintain it. To use the eloquent language of Mr. Charles Sumner, in his speech on the 26th of August in the American Senate, on the Fugitive Slave Bill:—"A power so peculiar and offensive, so hostile to reason, so repugnant to the law of nature and the inborn rights of man, which despoils its victims of the fruits of their labour; which substitutes concubinage for marriage; which abrogates the relation of parent and child; which, by a denial of education, abuses the intellect, prevents a true knowledge of God, and murders the very soul; which, amidst a plausible physical comfort, degrades man, created in the divine image, to the level of a beast;—such a power, so eminent, so

* Brevard's Digest, vol. ii. p. 236.

† Brevard's Digest of the Laws of Louisiana, Code Noir, vol. i. § 33.

‡ Laws of Tennessee, 1831, vol. i. p. 321.

|| Laws of Mississippi, Section ii.

transcendent, so tyrannical, so unjust, can find no place in any system of government, unless by virtue of *positive sanction*. It can spring from no doubtful phrases. It must be declared by unambiguous words, incapable of a double sense." So self-evident is this, that even the slaveholding tribunals have seen it. Mr. Sumner quotes the Supreme Court of Kentucky as declaring,—*"We view this as a right existing by positive law of a municipal character, without foundation in the law of nature or the common law."*

The main argument of the Carolinian may be thus shortly stated,—*"Whatever is not evil in itself ought to be judged favourably and acquitted without any reference to its abuses. Slavery is not evil in itself; therefore it must be judged irrespective of its abuses."* We deny both premises, and for reasons already given. We deny the first premiss, because, though it is true that we ought to *distinguish* between evils that are intrinsic, and incidental evils arising from accidental abuse; and also true that we ought not to condemn *at once* whatever may be abused—for food may cause death to the intemperate; yet to put *out of account altogether* the danger of abuses to which any thing is liable, is an absurdity which no one would be guilty of in ordinary life. The tyranny of Nero was only the abuse of power which an absolute sovereign *might* have exercised for the benefit of his subjects.

We also deny the second premiss, that slavery is not evil in itself. Slavery is an evil when not abused, and when the master is kind and judicious. Even if we could find security for a despot, that he should exercise his despotic power benevolently, yet his sway must degrade and paralyze the character of his subjects. For proof we need only point to the Indians under the rule of the Jesuits in Paraguay.

Slavery unnaturally dissociates the ideas of *labour* and of *subsistence and enjoyment*. Any clown in England talks of "looking out for work," and grieves at being "out of work"—thereby meaning wages. Now the most intelligent slave can have no such association in his mind. But the Carolinian regards slavery as an excellent *training*. What then, we ask, is its end? Children are kept in a state of implicit submission, and compulsory training, on purpose that they may grow up into men fit to take care of themselves; and slaves it seems *on purpose* that they may *not*.

Mrs. Stowe has perceived (what is often overlooked) the peculiar difficulty, arising from his condition, in giving such moral

lessons to the negro as shall be consistent with slave institutions. She puts the remark into the mouth of St. Clare, the intellectual, the refined, the humane and generous St. Clare, who would have been the great and the noble but for

*"Things incomplete and purposes betrayed,
The saddest transits o'er truth's mystic glass."*

He says, "As to honesty, the slave is kept in that dependent semi-childish state, that there is no making him realize the rights of property, or feel that his master's goods are not his own, if he can get them. For my part, I don't see how they *can* be honest." Most persons would say, teach the slave that theft is a sin—granted, but he will deny that it *is* a theft. It is enemy's property, and fair spoil. He is not a member of the community. It is a hostile one.

*"Think'st thou we will not sally forth,
To spoil the spoiler as we may,
And from the robber rend the prey."*

His master has stolen *him*, or at least is a receiver. And he will ask whether if you were taken prisoner by bandits, and either kept by them or transferred by them to others—you would, though you might be deterred by *fear* in some cases from attempting to escape, feel any scruple of conscience—any doubt of the *right*—to mount their best horse and ride off! Such is the slave's case. You cannot prove to him that he has not a fair right to anything (including himself) belonging to his master, or to any other member of the community which is hostile to him. It is not coveting one's neighbour's goods to sue another for damages for false imprisonment.

It is this impossibility of reconciling moral right with the institutions of slavery, that causes the peculiar difficulty of imparting moral instruction to the negro, and makes the slaveholder so averse to its being even attempted. Thus it is that most missionaries, except the Moravians, have made slaves discontented and rebellious. For when men acquire any notion of justice, they apply it very readily universally: and assuredly the negroes might well inquire why *their* prescriptive title to traffic in the personal effects of their master, or to dispose of his person, should be one degree less inviolate than that of the master to trade upon their flesh and blood. It is not quite so easy a matter to give a negro as clear ideas of the *meum* and *tuum* as Mrs. Eastman's Aunt Phillis had. "I am an honest woman," she says, "and not in the

habit of *taking* anything. I would not *take* my freedom." We might easily shew that a similar difficulty stands in the way of inculcating any other moral precept.

But, how then do the Moravian missionaries proceed? And how did Paul proceed? How did he freely instruct slaves, while guarding his instructions against anything tending to a servile war? We find that Paul based his exhortations to them, as indeed to all his Christian converts, on the duty of not *raising a prejudice against the gospel*. If respect for authority is to be inculcated, it is thus he urges it:—"Let as many servants as are under the yoke count their masters worthy of all honour, that the name of God and his doctrine be not blasphemed." Are honesty and fidelity urged?—they are urged on the same ground: "Not purloining, but shewing all good fidelity, that they may *adorn the doctrine* of God our Saviour in all things." It has been well said that "the christian system is one which substitutes sublime principles for exact rules." And the apostles, while labouring constantly to inculcate these principles, left men who had embraced them (as Dr. Hinds remarks in his "History of the Origin of Christianity") to rectify their institutions accordingly for themselves. They carefully abstained from politics—that is, from all direct interference with social institutions. Every political question may be made out to be somehow connected with religion; but the apostles were not satisfied with abstaining from all interference with whatever had no connexion with religion; they abstained from any direct interference even with current politics, in the works of their christian mission. They shew, by their example, that it is not the office of the Church of Christ to ally itself with any *one* party in the community; but rather to permeate all human society, by an indirect (often unconscious) influence and reconciling power. But if this silence of the apostles on the special and individual application to slavery of the principles they inculcated, be the sanction for the system, as some American slaveholders maintain it is, then *despotism* is as much sanctioned by Scripture as *slavery*. The American defenders of slavery will scarcely like to accept this conclusion from their premisses: and yet certain it is that the tyranny of Nero is as much sanctioned by this silence, and by the apostolic exhortations to "honour the king," as the oppression of the slave.

If, then, there be no sanction for slavery in this apostolic silence and submission, as regards the then existing institution of slavery, we assuredly cannot find it in the

principles, the motives, and the examples which the New Testament sets before us. We need not multiply commonplace quotations. Indeed it seems that the inconsistency of slavery with the spirit and general principles of Christianity was clearly seen by the legislators of South Carolina themselves; for one of the first articles of the code organizing slavery contains a formal declaration, "that a slave who shall be baptized is in nowise, in virtue thereof, to be given his freedom.*" But the Carolinian, as the organ of the southern slaveholders, declares the system to be of God, and regards it as the "five talents" committed to them, which it "would be a weak and wicked prayer to ask to be taken from them." Indeed, such stress do slaveholders lay upon the divine sanction, that it would seem as if they were such only in homage to religion. But such homage to the Prince of Peace—to Him with "the easy yoke and the light burden"—to Him who "takes the lambs in his bosom, and gently leads those that are with young,"—such tribute pours foul scorn on Him, and reminds us rather of the "purple robe," and the "reed," and the mocking.

But it is suggested that the relation of the slave to his master may even be a spring of moral elevation, generating great blessings, and becoming a relation of kindness and charity "eminently calculated to give rise to the christian virtues,"—that thus the very spirit of Christianity may be incorporated in the actual system of slavery. While among the New Englanders the poor are only occasionally seen, and that chiefly by the humane Jews, the slaveholders, having the poor always with them, are in a position that promotes their active usefulness, at some sacrifice perhaps of their romantic sensibilities. Is this meant for an illustration of Butler's well-known doctrine of the active and passive habits? ought not the Bishop then to have enjoined us to keep slaves chained to our hall-doors, in order to secure an increase of our "active usefulness," even at the expense of our romantic feelings?

As to the argument, that slavery was from the first intended as the fulfilment of God's curse upon the descendants of Canaan, we can only say, that however little we may desire to feel as Mrs. Eastman says Aunt Phillis did under her full conviction of this—as if burning in Hecla, though fully submitting to the inevitable decree—yet we still less envy the feelings of those slave-

* Laws of South Carolina, Digest ii., Slaves, p. 210.

holders who are content to believe themselves the fulfillers—the executioners—of a curse on their fellow-men. But it does seem a strange perversion to turn a prophecy of evil into a precept to commit it. On this shewing, the Pharaohs were obedient servants of God in evil-entreating his people, and the Jews were justified in their crime against Him whom they crucified.

There is one point more in the Carolinian's pamphlet which we must notice. He has taken advantage of a fallacy put by Mrs. Stowe into St. Clare's mouth, but merely for the purpose of putting the slaveholder's most plausible argument in the most plausible way. He states that a *capitalist* is virtually a slaveowner as much as a Virginian planter, since, with the employed in England, it is only "work or be starved," instead of "work or be flogged." This fallacy, the slaveholder catches at, "glad," as Mrs. Stowe says, "of any fig-leaf of covering from the intolerable blaze of the scorn of civilized humanity." He makes up his mind that "this power that slavery gives to one man over another is met with everywhere in society," that all the actual misery and degradation of the slave is nothing more than what is to be found in all countries, and that it is as vain to contend against what he believes to be an absolute decree of Providence, in regard to the constitution of society, as it is to contend against storms, earthquakes, and blights. He admits that the slave is wretched and degraded, but he takes comfort to himself in pointing to human Beings still more debased. Indeed, the way this argument is pushed, would seem to imply that *better* must always mean *good*. But it is totally false that the condition of the slave is not infinitely worse than that of the poorest labourer in England. Indeed, it must be so, as long as a position in which evil is *legally inevitable*, is worse than that in which it *may lawfully be avoided*. If our poor are effectually taught to lay by when they have good wages, not to marry improvidently, not to bring up their children in ignorance, not to join trade-unions, (a horrible slavery, but self-imposed,) and to guard against various other things prejudicial to their well-being and dependent upon themselves to avoid, their condition will indefinitely improve. No *legislative* restriction sets any limit to that improvement. If a man be not "straitened in himself," the law of the land does not straiten him, nor does any impassable barrier narrow up his career. The man of the lowest grade in England *may* attain any position, not hereditary. And in these days of philanthropic effort,

amid many deplorable social evils, much effort, wise and unwise, is making to impart to our poor that knowledge, and to encourage them to the exercise of that forethought, which would give them self-dependence and self-respect.

An American writer of a book, entitled "England's Glory and her Shame," gives the result of his (supposed) observations during a "tour in the *manufacturing districts* of England," and draws a most appalling picture of the misery and degradation of the manufacturers; to the great consolation, no doubt, of the American slave-owners, who are thus left satisfied that if slavery is a bad thing, there is no alternative but something worse. Now, we happen to have ascertained, through the medium of a gentleman who personally knew the author, that he *set foot in Europe*, but concocted his work partly from Blue-books, and perhaps partly from imagination.

It must, however, be added, in fairness to the author, that he was probably not aware of the amount of misrepresentation some of these Blue-books contain. They are the Reports of the Evidence taken before the Committee on the Ten-hours' Bill—a work which too much resembled a supposed botanical examination of a certain farm and garden, resulting in a collection of a few nettles out of one field, and four or five thistles out of another, and a handful of groundsel from the garden; representing these as *the produce of the estate*.

But we shall place before our readers a short digest of slave-laws of the South and West, and ask them to contrast the condition to which the slave is shut up by law in America, with that of the very poorest free-man in a free country. If the following statement does not exhibit what American slave-holders *actually* practise, it shows at least what it is *possible* for them to practise, within the limit of American law.

"1. Slavery is hereditary and perpetual, to the last moment of the slave's earthly existence, and to all his descendants to the latest posterity.

"2. The labour of the slave is compulsory and uncompensated; while the kind of labour, the amount of toil, the time allowed for rest, are dictated solely by the master. No bargain is made, no wages given. A proud despotism governs the human brute; and even his covering and provender, both as to quantity and quality, depend entirely on the master's discretion. To use the language of Judge Stroud, 'The slave is entirely under the control of his master—is unprovided with a protector—and, especially, he cannot be a witness or make complaint in any known mode against his master.'

"3. The slave being considered a personal chattel may be sold, or pledged, or leased, at

the will of his master. He may be exchanged for marketable commodities, or taken in execution for the debts or taxes either of a living or dead master. Sold at auction, either individually or in lots to suit the purchaser. He may remain with his family, or be separated from them for ever.

"4. Slaves can make no contracts, and have no legal right to any property, real or personal. Their own honest earnings, and the legacies of friends, belong in point of law to their masters.

"5. Neither a slave or a free coloured person can be a witness against any *white* or free person in a court of justice, however atrocious may have been the crimes they have seen him commit, if such testimony would be for the benefit of a *slave*; but they may give testimony *against a fellow slave*, or free coloured man. Even in cases affecting life, if the *master* is to reap the advantage of it.

"6. The slave may be punished at his master's discretion—without trial—without any means of legal redress; whether his offence be real or imaginary; and the master can transfer the same despotic power to any person or persons he may choose to appoint.

"7. The slave is not allowed to resist any free man under any circumstances; *his* only safety consists in the fact that his *owner* may bring suit and recover the price of his body, in case his life is taken, or his limbs rendered unfit for labour.

"8. Slaves cannot redeem themselves, or obtain a change of masters, though cruel treatment may have rendered such a change necessary for their personal safety.

"9. The slave is entirely unprotected in his domestic relations.

"10. The laws greatly obstruct the manumission of slaves, even where the master is willing to enfranchise them.

"11. The operation of the laws tends to deprive slaves of religious instruction and consolation.

"12. The whole power of the laws is exerted to keep slaves in a state of the lowest ignorance.

"13. There is in this country a monstrous inequality of law and right. What is a trifling fault in a *white* man, is considered highly criminal in the *slave*; the same offences which cost a white man a few dollars only are punished in the negro with death."

A word, in conclusion, in reference to Uncle Tom himself and his history. If there is nothing in American law to justify any presumption against the truth of this picture, neither is there anything in human nature to prevent the possibilities of the law from being converted into realities of social life. Cases strikingly similar to Uncle Tom are not unknown, though it is said that Mrs. Stowe in portraying the meekly heroic old man has drawn altogether on her fancy. We have been furnished with a case of actual occurrence, which we offer as proof that this exhibition of Christian prin-

ciple and devotedness unto death is not without a parallel:—

"In the summer of 1849," says the editor of the *Pittsburg Visitor*, "we were in Louisville, Kentucky. As no great change has ever taken place in our opinion on this slavery question, we were at some loss then for a place to go to preaching, and used on Sabbath to walk out to a grave-yard, or into the fields, or up and down the streets in search of sermons.

"One forenoon passing a little church from whence the sound of singing arose, Brother Samuel, who was with us, remarked that it was a congregation of Methodists, and a missionary station, and that he had once dropped in there and heard a sermon he liked.

"We went in and took a seat. A plain-looking elderly man preached in the style usual for Methodist preachers in country places—all about religion—its comforts in life, and triumphs in death. He insisted, with great earnestness, that it was a 'great thing to be a Christian.' Religion—it made the weak strong, and the meanest most honourable. To illustrate this grand truth he told an anecdote, as something coming within the range of his own knowledge, of an old slave who had 'got religion.' His master was kind, but irreligious and reckless, and was withal much impressed by the earnestness of his servant's prayers and exhortations. But one day, one evil day, on Sabbath, too, this same kind master, was drinking, and playing cards with a visitor, when the conversation turned upon the religion of slaves. The visitor boasted that he could 'whip the religion out of any nigger in the State in half an hour.' The master, proud of possessing a rare specimen, boasted that he had one out of whom the religion could not be whipped. A bet was laid, and the martyr summoned. A fearful oath of recantation and blasphemous denial of his Saviour was required of the old disciple, upon pain of being whipped to death. The answer was, 'Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't.' Threats, oaths and entreaties, and noise were tried, but he fell on his knees, and holding up his hands, pleaded, 'Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't. Jesus, he die for me. Massa, please Massa, I can't.' The executioner summoned his aids, the old man was tied up, and the whipping commenced; but the shrieks for mercy were all intermingled with prayers and praises—prayers for his own soul and those of his murderers. When fainting and revived, the terms of future freedom from punishment were offered again and again; he put them away with the continued exclamation, 'Jesus, he die for me; Bless de Lord, Massa, I can't.' The bet was to the full value of the property endangered. The men were flushed with wine, and the experimenter on nigger religion insisted upon trying it out. Honour demanded he should have a fair chance to win his bet; and the old disciple died under the lash, blessing the Lord that Jesus had died for him!

"The preacher gave his recital with many tears, and before he was done we do not think there was a dry eye, except our own in the house. Our pulses all stood still with horror,

but the speaker did not appear to dream that his story had any bearing against the institutions with which he was surrounded.

"We cannot remember how he said the particulars came to his knowledge, but think the martyr had been under his pastoral care, and that he got the minute from slave witnesses in 'love-feast.'

"He gave us the story simply to shew what a good thing religion was. Of those who heard it, and the many persons there to whom we related it, we found not one who appeared to doubt it. Any indignation felt and expressed was against the individual actors in the tragedy."

We are compelled by our limits, to bring this article to a close—not by having exhausted, or nearly exhausted, the subject. In fact, the most *practical* part of it remains behind. We shall perhaps return to it on some future occasion. Meantime, we beg to assure all really humane and christian Americans, whether Northern or Southern, that we have written "more in sorrow than in anger;" that we sincerely wish their deliverance from the truly difficult position in which they are placed, and that we are actuated by no spirit of hostile rivalry, but have endeavoured to speak the truth in love.

ART. VIII.—1. *Twelfth General Report of the Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners*. Presented to Parliament by Command. London, 1852.

2. *Practical Instructions to Boards of Guardians as to the Emigration of Poor Persons at the Cost of the Poor Rate*. By W. G. LUMLEY. London, 1852.

3. *Correspondence relating to Emigration from the Highlands and Islands of Scotland*. Parliamentary Paper. London, 1852.

4. *Memoir and Labours of Caroline Chisholm*. London, 1852.

EMIGRATION is the natural method by which old countries are to be relieved, and new countries to be peopled; the operation designed by Providence for at once mitigating the evils of civilisation and eradicating those of barbarism; the mode of transferring the surplus wealth and population which in the course of time have become a burden instead of a benefit in the limited field of employment where they had their origin, to lands which need nothing but this transfer to be converted from a wilderness into a garden; the means of spreading over the globe those arts, those luxuries, that

knowledge, that religion, those literary and scientific achievements, in a word, that aggregate of social gains which have sprung up in remote and specially favoured centres of human existence. To the more improving and energetic races of men, emigration from an overcrowded home to emptier and more attractive quarters, is as natural and instinctive a movement as swarming is to bees; it is forced upon them by nearly the same necessity; and, if well-timed and wisely conducted, is rewarded by pretty much the same results.

There probably never was a nation to which emigration on a great scale was more urgently suggested than to England in the middle of the nineteenth century—both by difficulties at home and by attractions abroad. Her population and her wealth were rapidly increasing, but the field for the employment of both was limited; the rate of profit was diminishing; the rate of interest was being reduced; all professions were overstocked; distress, in one circle or another, was frequent and recurrent; and in all ranks "the uneasy class" was on the increase. On the other hand, our colonies were clamorous for a supply of labour; they were boundless in extent; they embraced every variety of climate, from the arctic to the tropical; they offered every variety of occupation to the emigrant, from the shepherd to the lumberer; and they promised a field to nearly every description of talent and activity. Above all, they assured to every one the certainty of an unanxious future. On the one side was an insatiable demand: on the other an inexhaustible supply.

We are not disposed to draw a gloomy picture of the condition of our people. That condition on the whole has greatly improved in the last forty or fifty years. Not only has wealth and luxury greatly increased, but the mass of the community have been more than ever before participators in all those advantages which enterprise and science have created. The consumption of luxuries has greatly augmented among all classes; the price of food and clothing has diminished; locomotion has become immensely cheaper, more rapid, and more general; agriculture has improved; and commerce and manufactures are still extending and generally flourishing. In the general aspect of the country there is unquestionably much ground for gratitude, and for self-congratulation. But if, descending from the statistical height which has given us this bird's-eye view, we examine the constituents of English society a little in detail, we are perplexed and pained by much that is exceptional or contradic-

tory. The whole community seems to be afflicted with what the French call a sort of *malaise générale*; and the symptoms of the malady are nearly uniform in each rank. The "uneasy class," as it has been aptly termed, is not a distinct section of the nation, but consists of a vast aggregate of contributions from every section. The highest and the lowest orders alike furnish their quota. All, in every rank, who cannot indulge in the common privilege of humanity, the enjoyment of the domestic ties, without losing their status in society—who can only purchase a wife and children at the cost of every other blessing, and who therefore shrink from the absorbing price—belong to the "uneasy class." Among the aristocracy, those younger sons, whose parents can bequeath to them no adequate income; whom the exhaustion of the family interest, or the progress of popular retrenchment, cuts off from the old chances of a comfortable sinecure; who are too poor, too proud, or too unenterprising for the exacting occupations of commerce; who, if they enter the Church, have no fat family living to inherit, and feel no superior capacities by which to carve their way to a prebend or a bishopric, who know that the army or the navy, though an honourable profession, is scarcely ever wealth, and seldom even livelihood, to any but the favoured children of fortune; whose talents at the bar—where they would have to meet the competition of rivals inured to labour, trained to endurance and stimulated by actual want—would probably never secure them a single brief; whose only prospect, therefore, is to vegetate on some wretched subordinate post in the administration, or to purchase an income by expatriation as governor or secretary to some cheerless and uncultured colony,—these are among the contributions of our nobility and gentry to the "uneasy class." The poverty and privations of these unprovided scions of the great are severer than is commonly supposed, and their numbers are very considerable. They have often to live as dependants through the whole of life; they have to maintain the externals not only of gentility but of wealth, on an income barely adequate to the merest needs of high society; by the right and the necessity of birth they live in daily contact with the most enervating and enviable luxury which they must in a manner share and endure, yet scarcely enjoy or grasp; and they are condemned to perpetual celibacy, from the curse of which they can only escape by the low achievement of hunting down an heiress. The junior branches of the other sex are little better off: with hundreds of them the

sweet natural ties of wife and mother are felt, at an early age, to be almost unattainable: if they are beautiful they must barter their loveliness for a wealthy suitor; if they have few personal attractions, their probable lot is either to fritter away existence in insipid distractions, or to wither slowly,—wretchedly virtuous—poor lay nuns, torn and shaken by earnest natural affections—unconsoled even by the sad delusions of a religious vocation—a perpetual protest against the great undiscovered wrong or blunder of the world.

As we descend in the social scale the contributions to the "uneasy class" increase. All who are anxious, and with reason, as to their own future or that of their children, belong to it. The farmers, as a body, it is well known, belong to it. They scarcely ever accumulate property: they can seldom even hold their own. People with fixed money incomes have indeed, for many years, been rising in the world, in consequence of the steady and considerable reduction which has taken place in the price of all articles. But the recent discoveries of gold make it questionable whether the tendency henceforth will not set in an opposite direction. People, too, with fixed money incomes have generally small incomes, and the very circumstance that these incomes *are* fixed and incapable of increase, renders their possessors anxious about the future, and fearful of encountering the burden of a family, which they have even fewer facilities than others for placing out in the world. Persons, again, living on the interest of money, have, for a long series of years, found their incomes alarmingly diminished. Five per cent. used to be attainable where three and a half is scarcely to be got now. The profits of trade, too, have fallen off, *pari passu*, with the interest of money. Political economists explain to us that this must be so: any one who will compare his own rate of profit with that which his father tantalizes him by describing as usual in his day, knows that it is so. Numbers of merchants, manufacturers, and tradesmen belong to the "uneasy class." The year 1847 shewed how even the wealthiest might be reduced to poverty at a stroke. These classes are far more numerous than they used to be; but how few among them feel any real security as to the subsistence or the careers of their children! How frequent and how stern have been the warnings against indulging in any such security! Every merchant knows how difficult it is to place his son in first-rate counting-houses. Every manufacturer knows how difficult it is to find for his son, however diligent and steady, a safe partnership, unless he

has a large capital wherewith to purchase it. "The desire to establish children in the world is the same as ever, while the difficulty of accomplishing that object is much greater; since beginners in trade require a much larger capital than formerly to obtain the same income; unfavourable accidents happen as before, while bankruptcies, complete or partial, are more frequent than ever. The existence, therefore, of all those whose incomes are derived from the employment of capital—except great capitalists, who can easily save out of diminished incomes—is a continual struggle with difficulties. How to make the two ends meet; which way to turn; how to provide for one claim without neglecting another; how to escape what they consider degradation; how on earth to manage for their children:—these are the thoughts which trouble and perplex them. The anxious, vexed, or harassed class, would be a better name for them than the milder term which I have used."*

The case is the same in professions: all are overstocked; in all there is the same intense competition; in all there are vast numbers of disappointed votaries; in all the blanks are many and the prizes few. Every year sees fresh clergymen issuing from college, anxious, and often for long years anxious in vain, for a miserable curacy; and reduced to support life by the most strenuous contrivances till they can obtain one. How many never get beyond a curacy! How many pass their whole lives in a ceaseless struggle with embarrassment and want! How many are summoned down from their most aspiring dreams of human regeneration

"To stoop to strive with misery at the door!"

How many find themselves unable, even by the severest labour and the strictest frugality, to escape debt and disgrace!—In the medical profession again, how few are those who grow rich in comparison with those who remain poor! How few are those who make a large income compared with those who make no income at all! And how many anxious and suffering years have been endured even by the most successful, at the outset of their career! Probably at least half of those who have embraced this profession have lived during the greater portion of life upon their private fortune, not on their professional gains. Diligence, skill, science, prudence—unless far beyond the average—are unavailing to secure practice or emolument. More than average opportunities—more than average good fortune—are needed in addition. The case of the bar is even

more dispiriting. Here it is certain that only a minority actually live by their profession. The majority pass the best years of their life sickening in expectation of a brief, though thoroughly acquainted with their profession, unremitting in their application, and inured to any severity of toil. It was, indeed, given in evidence before the Official Salaries Committee, which sat two years ago, that legal business was becoming more diffused than formerly; and that fewer barristers made enormous fortunes, while a larger number were in receipt of moderate emoluments. Still it is notorious that not more than one-third of those who are annually called ever rise to live by their profession. The same remarks apply to the class of engineers, artists, literary men, and clerks: "Two-thirds of them live by snatching the bread out of each other's mouths." The case of governesses speaks volumes; and volumes of indescribable sadness. A vast proportion of them have never been intended or educated for their occupation, but have been reduced to it by the misfortunes or non-success of their families. Numbers of them have fallen suddenly—numbers more have sunk gradually—from the easy into the uneasy class. They are now to be had of any character, with any acquirements, on almost any terms. Every one who advertises is embarrassed and overwhelmed by the multitude of the applicants. And for what? For the wages of a butler or a London footman; and for a situation in some cases—be it said with pain and shame—more equivocal and ignominious.

Now, in all these instances the root of the evil is identical. The labourers are too many for the vineyard. The hands are seeking for the work, instead of the work being clamorous for the hands to do it. For every job there are two applicants; and, of the two, one only can be employed and fed. Notwithstanding the vast increase in our national wealth; notwithstanding the multiplied and daily multiplying wants which our luxurious civilisation has engendered,—the field of employment is still too limited for the numbers who are crowding into it. Hence the severity of competition; hence the intensity of pursuit necessary to success in any line; hence the uncertainty of victory even to the best-strung energies. Hence that sad aspect which, amid all its more glorious features, English society presents,—of a race of men, capable of a higher destiny, meant for calmer enjoyment and for nobler aims, to whom life is not a pilgrimage but a race,—whose whole existence, from the cradle to the grave, is one breathless hurry—a crush, a struggle, and a strife!

* England and America, i. 93.

Things do not brighten as we go down. The agricultural labourers, who may now number about a million, exclusive of their families, have long been in a condition which is at once a grief, a perplexity, and a reproach. It is not that they are worse off now than formerly,*—we believe the reverse to be unquestionable—but still their state is to the last degree unsatisfactory; and has been so, time out of mind. In some counties they are more prosperous and better paid than in others: generally speaking, their position deteriorates in proportion as agriculture is the only occupation of the district. The labourers are better off in the north than in the south. In Lancashire, Yorkshire, Cumberland, and Westmoreland, they have in ordinary times not much to complain of. In Dorsetshire and Devonshire they seem to be permanently wretched. In Leicestershire and Lincolnshire the wages are often regular and ample: in Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, they are seldom such as adequately to support life. But as a whole it is, we fear, indisputable that the usual earnings of the rural day-labourer are not sufficient to provide his family with food, clothing, and habitation, of fitting kind and quantity; life is spent in “the hard struggle of living,”—a struggle successful or unsuccessful, as the case may be; but on either supposition, leaving no leisure for enjoyment or improvement, and offering no possibility of rising; on either supposition, scarcely an existence suitable for men with intellects, souls, and human affections,—scarcely an existence which we can bear to regard as the normal and inevitable one for large classes of our countrymen.

If from rural we turn to artisan life, we find evils of a different, but scarcely less lamentable sort. As a rule, the *employed* artisans are in receipt of earnings which, rightly spent, might support them in comfort, raise them above want, provide for the future, and often elevate them into the class of capitalists. But great numbers of them—perhaps the majority—are reckless and wasteful: they make no provision for future vicissitudes; and when reverses come, they are as destitute as if they had never known what wealth was. The people engaged in the iron works of Wales and Monmouthshire, in the hardware trades of Birmingham

and its vicinity, and in the manufacture of Lancashire and Cheshire, are specimens of this class. Others, again, as the handloom weavers of Lancashire, Paisley, and Spitalfields, are either always or periodically in distress; their numbers are greater than the regular demand for their productions can support; sometimes they can find no employment; at other times they are compelled to work excessive hours in order to scrape together wages adequate for their subsistence. There are some localities (as in Leicestershire for example) where distress has arisen from the dying out or the removal of a once lucrative trade. But throughout a great body of the artisan population, the complaint—made less by them than for them; true to a great extent, but to a great extent also self-caused—is the same: their toil is so incessant and severe, as to leave no time nor wish for anything but sleep, and to render their life an alarming approximation to that of the brutes that perish.

There is yet another class, of whose condition fearful pictures have of late been laid before the world—the distressed work-people of large towns—the distressed needlewomen; the distressed tailors; the distressed bootmakers, and others, who, in the very midst of wealth, are said to be in destitution and squalor indescribable; in the midst of freedom to be actually and physically in bondage as savage and inescapable as that of the American negro. These classes are said to number some thousands in the metropolis alone; and their sufferings and privations to be such as can scarcely be credited in a civilized and Christian country. Nor, whatever may be our opinion as to the causes of their wretchedness, or the undue colouring thrown over it, can we refuse to believe in the general fact of its existence.

There was enough, one would have thought, in such a state of things as we have described, to induce whole swarms of our countrymen to leave the old world, where they were so anxious and so wretched, and flock to those more favoured scenes where a cordial welcome awaited them, and where at least they might feel secure of ample subsistence and an improving future. But many difficulties and deterrents stood in the way. The educated and refined classes, painful and anomalous as was often their position here, shrunk from leaving behind them all the elegancies of polished life, all the amenities of cultivated society, and plunging into scenes where success must be purchased by unremitting toil and frequent and cheerless isolation; where the

* In the whole of this picture it must be borne in mind that we are describing the English community, not precisely as it presents itself to our observation in this autumn of 1852, when emigration, free trade, and a succession of good harvests, have combined to place all classes—especially the labourers—for the time, in a condition of unusual comfort and prosperity: we are delineating England as it averaged in the aggregate from 1840 to 1850.

gentleman and the labourer was nearly on a level, and sometimes the latter had even the advantage; and where those, who in England had belonged to the ruling class, would often find themselves at the mercy and under the control of meddling and vulgar officials. The industrious classes, whose education had taught them little of any country but their own, were alarmed at the length of the voyage, and the distance of the colony, and had formed exaggerated notions of the dangers and embarrassments which attend the emigrant life—of the contest with savage nature and savage men. The destitute did not know how to go, and for many years no arrangements were made to facilitate their transfer. Emigration therefore proceeded but slowly, though at an increasing rate: some new and extraordinary stimulants were wanting to give an impulse to the movement adequate to the requirements of the case. These stimulants Providence sent, in the famine in Ireland and the Highlands, and the gold discoveries in Australia. The effect of these in giving vigour and expansion to the previously languid exodus from our shores, may be seen from the following table, from which it appears that in twenty-two years, from 1825 to 1846 inclusive, the emigration from the United Kingdom was only 1,480,000, or about 67,300 yearly, whereas in the five years from 1847 to 1851, it has been 1,422,670, or more than 284,500 per annum.*

EMIGRATION FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM FROM
1825 TO 1851, INCLUSIVE.

Years.	N. American Colonies.	U. States.	Australia and New Zealand.	All other Places.	Total.
1825	8,741	5,551	485	114	14,891
1826	12,818	7,063	903	116	20,900
1827	12,648	14,526	715	114	28,003
1828	12,084	12,817	1,056	135	26,092
1829	13,307	15,678	2,016	197	31,198
1830	30,574	24,887	1,242	204	56,907
1831	58,067	23,418	1,561	114	83,160
1832	66,339	32,872	3,733	196	103,140
1833	28,808	29,109	4,093	517	62,527
1834	40,060	33,074	2,800	283	76,222
1835	15,573	26,720	1,860	325	44,478
1836	34,226	37,774	3,124	293	75,417
1837	29,884	36,770	5,051	326	72,034
1838	4,577	14,332	14,021	292	33,222
1839	13,658	33,536	15,786	227	62,207
1840	32,293	40,642	15,850	1,958	90,743
1841	39,164	45,017	32,625	2,786	118,592
1842	54,123	63,552	8,534	1,835	128,344
1843	25,518	28,335	3,478	1,891	57,212
1844	22,924	43,660	2,229	1,873	70,636
1845	31,803	58,538	830	2,330	93,501
1846	49,439	82,239	2,847	1,826	129,551
1847	109,650	142,154	4,949	1,487	258,270
1848	31,065	188,233	23,904	4,897	248,089
1849	41,367	219,450	32,091	6,590	299,498
1850	32,961	223,078	16,037	8,773	280,849
1851	42,605	267,357	21,532	4,472	335,966
Total.	834,306	1,750,682	222,955	44,056	2,901,999

* England is not the only country which is relieving herself largely of her surplus population. The emigration from Germany is at the present

This year the emigration promises to be greater still. The following are the numbers who have gone out in the first six months of 1852:—

To the United States,	136,204
British North America,	19,453
Australian Colonies,	25,810
All other Places,	1,519
Total,	182,986

This is at the rate of 365,972 for the whole year, or exactly 1000 a day.

Let us now give attention for a few moments to the mode in which this emigration proceeds, and to the various arrangements which have been made to promote and facilitate it.

First, with regard to the emigration from Ireland, which is two-thirds of the whole. Of 335,966 who left the United Kingdom in 1851, 257,372 are stated to have been Irish; and of the 182,986 who have emigrated in the first six months of 1852, not less than 126,000 are Irish. There are two peculiar features about this Irish exodus. The first is, that nearly the whole of it is directed to the United States, either directly or through Canada. The *precise* numbers we have no means of ascertaining; but from data furnished by the Emigration Commissioners, (at pp. 11 and 13 of their last Report, which we have placed at the head of this Article,) we may calculate, that of the 257,372 who left Ireland last year, not less than 230,000 went to the United States. The second feature goes far to explain the first. Nearly the whole of the emigration from Ireland is conducted by funds furnished either by the emigrants themselves or by their friends in America. A few of the Irish proprietors have assisted their former tenants to escape to a more fortunate country, as a humane and peaceful method of effecting the necessary clearance of their

moment, and has been for some years, most extensive and systematic. The Germans emigrate mainly to the United States, and go in whole villages and communities at once, taking their clergymen with them, and having generally sent over some one before-hand to survey the promised land, and to make purchases and preparation for them. We have no means of ascertaining the numbers who have gone with any exactness, but they are estimated at 400,000 in recent years. The Central Emigration Society of Germany gives the numbers who sailed in 1852 as follows:

From Bremen,	37,943
" Hamburg,	18,127
" Havre,	35,000
" Rotterdam,	3,000
" Antwerp,	9,243

Total, 103,313

Carrying with them on an average 200 Thalers, or about £30 each, or a total of £3,000,000.

estates, and the Emigration Commissioners have, in the course of ten years, aided 34,052 to reach Australia; but by far the greater proportion of the passage-money of the Irish emigrants has been sent over from America. The sums remitted for this purpose, which the Commissioners have been enabled to trace, amounted, in

1848, to upwards of	£460,000
1849,	540,000
1850,	957,000
1851,	990,000

Now the average expense of reaching the Australian colonies is about £15 a-head; that of emigrating to America does not exceed £4. Everything therefore combines to direct Irish emigration to the United States—the comparative cheapness of the transit, the fact that both the means and the attraction are furnished by their relatives who have preceded them, and added to these motives, we fear, is the strongly operative one of a desire to escape from the hated domination of the Saxons.

The emigration movement next in importance is that conducted by the "Colonial Land and Emigration Commissioners," who are supplied with funds from the Cape and the Australian colonies (chiefly arising from the sale of land) for the purpose of affording a free (or nearly free) passage thither to such emigrants as they shall deem suitable. Between 1847 and 1851 inclusive, about £800,000 had been thus expended, and 62,664 persons have been sent. The funds in the hands of the Commissioners are increasing, and their operations are beginning to be on a proportionately extensive scale. The discovery of gold has given an enormous stimulus to emigration to this quarter, and it appears probable that its entire amount (assisted and unassisted) will this year reach 50,000 against 21,000 last year.

There are three or four New Zealand colonies, each of which has its special corresponding society at home; they sent out last year an aggregate of 2677 emigrants.

But perhaps the most useful and the best conducted of all the emigration arrangements of this country is that which has been set on foot for transferring a portion of the population of the Western Highlands and the Hebrides to Australia. These districts, which had long been both poor and overpeopled, had suffered from the potato failure, in the same manner and nearly to the same extent as Ireland. Like Ireland they were inhabited by Celts—far more peaceful and manageable, indeed, than their brethren over

the Channel, but equally impoverished and unenergetic. They lived in the same way, on small crofts or farms, divided and subdivided as the families increased, keeping sometimes a cow, sometimes a few sheep, but subsisting mainly on potatoes and fish, and on the wages they could obtain in the Lowlands as agricultural labourers. Their numbers had become sadly redundant, and their condition very wretched, before the famine of 1846 and the succeeding years came to give them the *coup-de-grace*. Since that period they had been to a great extent supported by charity—a system which rapidly dried up their few remaining resources, and sapped their little remaining energy. Last year it became obvious that nothing but emigration on a large scale could save them. It is calculated that from 25,000 to 30,000 will have to be removed before the population in those barren and rocky districts will be reduced to an amount commensurate with their indigenous resources. At the same time the gold discoveries in Australia, by attracting away a large proportion of the herdsmen of the great grazing establishments, alarmed the proprietors of that colony for the safety of their flocks and the preservation of their yearly supply of wool. An urgent and sudden demand was made upon the mother country for some thousand shepherds. Now it happens that the Highlanders, both from taste and habit, are admirably adapted for this occupation. They are less fitted than either the English or the Lowlander for the steady and laborious pursuits of tillage; but the wild, rough, and comparatively easy life of the keepers of sheep and cattle exactly suited them. A society was therefore formed, under the skilful and energetic superintendence of Sir John McNeill and Sir Charles Trevelyan, for removing the superabundant population of the Western Highlands to the Australian colonies. Subscriptions were raised, and an Act of Parliament to facilitate aid from the Highland proprietors was passed. The arrangements made were most judicious and complete. Calculating on and respecting the strong family affections which are so marked a feature in the Gaelic race, and arguing that a shepherd surrounded with his wife and children in the bush would be far less likely than a single settler to desert his post for the feverish attractions of "the diggings,"—it was decided to send out whole families together. This made them both more willing to go, and more valuable and more reliable when they arrived. Moreover it was found that old men, though past the full vigour necessary for the severe labours of agriculture, would be still service-

able as shepherds from their steadiness and experience. Accordingly the Emigration Commissioners agreed to relax their rules as to passage-money, and to afford the whole family, young and old, a (partially) free passage to Australia at the expense of the colony, the deposit payable by the emigrant (in aid of the passage-money) rising with the tender or advanced age of the individual. This deposit, and the necessary outfit and the transmission to the port of embarkation, are provided in the proportion of *one-third* by the proprietor, whose estate is thus relieved of a heavy burden, and *two-thirds* by the general subscription. But in order at once to prevent the exhaustion of the funds thus obtained, and to prevent the injurious and demoralizing effects upon the emigrant of reliance on eleemosynary aid, a promissory note is required from him before he goes on board, by which he engages to pay back the amount advanced to him, by fixed instalments, the details of which are to be arranged with him by the society's correspondents in the colony, and which are to be deducted from his wages by the master by whom he is employed. In consideration of his entering into this engagement and keeping it, the society promises to charge no interest on the sum advanced, and to forego acting on the promissory note, which was made *payable on demand*. If, however, the emigrant should quit the ship, and escape with his outfit, or when arrived out should attempt to abscond to "the diggings," or should refuse to take regular employment, the promissory note can be at once acted upon. By this means, it is expected that nearly the whole of the advances will be recovered in little more than a year, and be available for new emigrants. The society has this year sent out nearly 4000 persons, at an average cost (over and above the passage-money afforded by the colony, and their own private resources) of about £3 a head; and it hopes every year to send out an equal or greater number till the population of the Western Highlands shall have been brought down to a level with the means of subsistence which those barren regions can supply.

For many years back there has been a considerable amount of emigration partially or wholly conducted by parochial funds. By the 4th and 5th of William IV. c. 76, parishes were authorized to borrow money on the security of their rates for the purpose of aiding such of their poor as might be willing to emigrate, whether paupers or not. Under this Act the following numbers have been aided to emigrate:—

Up to the year	1836	Persons.	Brought over,	Persons.
		In 1836		In 1844
	1837	754	1845	750
	1838	726	1846	208
	1839	529	1847	1,294
	1840	613	1848	
	1841	729	1849	1,576
	1842	936	1850	1,962
	1843	858	1851	1,840
Carry over		11,855	Total,	20,385

This year, however, another parochial movement has commenced which may become extensive and serviceable. The parish of St. Martin's-in-the-field has discovered that pauper families may be transported to Australia and fairly settled there for life, at the same cost as would only support them for a year at home. The rate-payers have therefore consented to a special rate of one penny in the pound for the purpose of thus removing those who have become chargeable, and who are willing to be removed to a more hopeful scene. They have just sent off the first shipload of sixty emigrants in good health and spirits, at a total cost of about £1000, or about £16 a head.

The name of Mrs. Chisholm is widely known to all who are interested in Australian colonization. This excellent, judicious, and able lady, has probably done more than any one individual to protect emigrants, and to render emigration easy and attractive. Her first undertaking was the establishment of a "Home for female emigrants" in Sydney, where young women were received on their first arrival, and retained till suitable situations could be found for them, and were thus saved from the almost certain ruin which awaited them, if left to their own resources, and compelled to find quarters for themselves. Her next step was to establish affiliated "Homes" in the interior; and she was in the habit of travelling long distances into the bush with batches of her *protégées*, and locating them all, one after another, in respectable families. Her exertions soon procured her aid from settlers, and the confidence of emigrants, and men as well as women used to apply to her to find them situations; while of those already doing well in the world, many would apply to her to send them servants, and some to recommend and choose their wives. From first to last she has succeeded in establishing 11,000 emigrants in comfortable situations, as well as in founding an institution and a system which, it may be hoped, will long survive. It is not easy indeed to overestimate either her merits or her services. She is now in England; and has set on foot a society for enabling families to emigrate al-

together, and thus avoid those painful separations so common under the old system (when the young and unencumbered only were taken,) which so greatly both retarded it and added to its hardships. She has not only enabled numbers of wives to rejoin their emigrant husbands, and children their emigrant parents, but has arranged a most admirable system by which young men and women go out, not as formerly, isolated and unprotected, but under the wing of respectable families; while Captain Chisholm remains in Australia to watch over the location of the emigrants whom his excellent lady thus consigns to him.

Finally, there remains for notice the Female Emigration Society, started by Mr. Sidney Herbert. This was first established with a view of providing a remote and respectable home for those destitute needlewomen of worthy character, on whose behalf public sympathy had recently been so largely aroused. We have no wish to speak of the difficulties which the founders of this society experienced in finding fit objects for their benevolence. In spite of these difficulties they have sent out, and we believe placed respectably and comfortably in Australia, a considerable number of females. They still continue their exertions, but we believe on Mrs. Chisholm's plan, and with her aid.*

Under the combined influence of the various inducements and facilities we have enumerated, emigration from the United Kingdom has now reached a height which begins to excite considerable alarm in the minds of many. It appears as if the old country had reached its culminating point, in population at least, and must henceforth decline. On a rough estimate it seems that the emigrants at least equal the addition to our numbers by the surplus of births over deaths; and in Ireland very considerably exceed this addition. "If this drain goes on, how (it is asked) shall we recruit our army? how find an adequate supply of labourers and servants? how meet the increased cost of agriculture? how maintain our manufacturing superiority in the face of rising wages and augmented cost of production?" Let us look all these dangers fairly in the face, and examine them a little in detail; for it is most important that we should ascertain as far as may be, the future that is before us, and that the public mind should be harassed by no vague or unfounded fears.

The case of Ireland must be considered separately. The facts are concisely these.

By the combined effect of emigration and famine, the population of Ireland was reduced from 8,175,124 in 1841 to 6,515,794 in 1851. But as there is every reason to believe that up to 1846, when the potato-rot first appeared, the previous moderate rate of annual increase (about half per cent.) had been maintained, the real amount of depopulation in the five years from 1846 to 1851, was from 8,379,500 to 6,575,794, or 372,740 per annum. The stream of emigration which set in from Ireland after the famine, has ever since continued to flow at an accelerated rate. The tie of affection to the old country seems to have been fairly broken; the attractions of the New World are annually increasing, as friends and relatives multiply on the other side of the Atlantic; the potato-rot continues, though in a mitigated form; labour has become scarce, but owing to the absence of capital, wages have not materially risen; farms are every day being consolidated, and estates are every day being cleared; and we are bound to say that we see no reason whatever to believe that the tide of emigration has received, or will yet receive, a check. From 1847 to 1850 inclusive, about 200,000 Irish emigrants annually left their country; in 1851, this number had risen to 257,000; and in the first six months of 1852, 125,000 have gone. Now, the total annual addition to the population by the surplus of births over deaths was from 1831 to 1841, (before any of the recent disturbing causes began to operate,) 65,157. But as for many years back Ireland has been exporting the most healthy and vigorous portion of her children, those in the prime of life by whom mainly multiplication is carried on, the Emigration Commissioners, in their recent Report, estimate that those who remain—being in an unusual and increasing proportion the old, the feeble, and the infantine—do not more than barely *keep up* their numbers. We believe this calculation to be quite correct. It follows, therefore, that the emigration from Ireland represents accurately enough the actual decrease of numbers; in other words, that Ireland is being depopulated at the rate of a QUARTER OF A MILLION *per annum*—a process which, if continued, will empty her entirely in the course of TWENTY-FOUR YEARS.

This is so: yet we avow that we view the process without either alarm or regret. We regard it as both a necessary and a most salutary operation. By no milder process—by no less wholesale exodus—could Ireland be regenerated and refloated. For generations she has had her head under water, and the chief part of her people have been in

* It is gratifying to know that of 319,000 steerage emigrants in 1851, 147,000 were women.

a state of chronic distress. They have multiplied like rabbits, and cultivated the soil like savages. It was stated ten years ago on the highest official authority, that 2,400,000 were habitually in a state of destitution, and dependent on eleemosynary aid for a considerable portion of the year. The Irish had few manufactures, and were little addicted to fishing. They looked almost exclusively to agriculture for subsistence; and their numbers were immeasurably greater than mere agriculture—especially such agriculture as theirs—could support. We borrow from the Quarterly Review of last December an argument and some figures which place the whole matter in a transparent and irrefragable light. The agricultural counties of England can scarcely maintain their own actual numbers, and do not even profess to support or employ their own increase. The cultivators of the soil have of late years actually diminished: more tillage is carried on with fewer labourers. The surplus and the increase of these counties find employment in other districts and in other occupations: they migrate to the towns; they find engagements in the factories or the railways. Now, the ten most purely agricultural counties in England, with a climate equal to that of Ireland, a far richer soil, and an immeasurably more efficient and productive style of cultivation, find themselves fully peopled (if not overpeopled) with a *population of one individual to four acres*:—Ireland, even with worse land, and with a population already decimated by famine, had in 1851 *a population of one individual to 2½ acres*;—in some districts the allowance was only two acres and a quarter, as will be seen by the following table:—

Provinces.	Statute acres inclusive of Lakes, &c.	Statute acres absolutely unimprovable.	Net available Stat. acres.	Population in 1852.	Acres to each Individual.
Ulster, . .	5,262,000	712,000	4,550,000	2,004,289	2.28
Leinster, .	4,825,000	200,000	4,625,000	1,667,771	2.78
Munster, .	5,913,000	873,000	5,040,000	1,831,817	2.79
Connaught,	4,180,000	750,000	3,430,000	1,011,937	3.39
Total Inland	20,180,000	2,535,000	17,645,000	6,516,794	2.71

In order then to bring agricultural and ill-cultivated Ireland to a level with agricultural and well-cultivated England, her population must be reduced to 4,500,000, or two millions below its amount in 1851. The tide of emigration may therefore go on at its present rate for at least eight or ten years before it has even done enough. For be it remembered we have in this case *two* evils to remedy—we have not only too many people, but we have the wrong kind of

people—we require not only to remove redundant numbers, but to replace them by a more energetic, more aspiring, and more improvable race. The state of things which every patriot and statesman should desire, is a continuous annual emigration (for at least a decade) of 250,000 Catholic Celts, and a simultaneous immigration of 50,000 Protestant Saxons or Scotch. In this direction lies the salvation of Ireland, the peace of England, and the solution of those political, social, and religious difficulties which have so long harassed and perplexed alike the most courageous, the most able, the most conscientious of our rulers. To this point should our most earnest efforts be directed:—not to check or discourage the actual Irish exodus, but to counterbalance it by encouraging a large infusion of more vigorous and hopeful British and Protestant blood.

We are not blind to the many excellent and estimable qualities of the Irish: blended with others, controlled, disciplined, guided by others, they are a useful and serviceable people;—left to their own devices, a prey to their own indolent, slovenly, and improvident tendencies, all history shows how helpless and prone to degenerate they are. They make a bad nation, but admirable ingredients in a nation. It is the same in other regions. Wherever they settle singly among Americans or British, they improve, advance, and civilize; wherever they *congregate*, so as to carry Ireland about with them, they continue what we see them at home. We do not, in saying this, by any means wish to imply that they are an *inferior* race, but simply that they are a *peculiar* one, and not fitted to *stand alone*, being deficient in that restless energy, those indefinite desires, which are the very mainsprings of successful colonization—deficient also in that faculty of self-government and self-control, in the absence of which free institutions can never flourish or be permanently maintained. But when their peculiarities have become modified, and their capacities developed, and their activity directed by an adequate amount of Scotch and English colonization of their country, we may hope to see all their good qualities brought out and *utilized*, and all their bad ones repressed, and controlled, till Ireland, so long a “howling wilderness,” shall begin “to blossom like the rose.” This colonization was recommended by Sir Robert Peel; it was attempted by Cromwell; and it is curious enough, that long before their time it was proposed by Lord Bacon, in an elaborate Memoir which he addressed to James I. in 1606. The chief reason why it has proceeded so slowly is to be found in

the inadequate security hitherto afforded to life and property in that unhappy country, in the perpetual outbreaks and disturbances which deter peaceful men from casting in their lot with such an unquiet race. It has now, however, fairly commenced, and will, we doubt not, proceed with accelerated pace. The extent to which it has already gone it is not easy to ascertain; but in many quarters we hear of the settlement both of English and Scotch purchasers of land, and tenant farmers. A short time since, a traveller happening to sit down at an ordinary at Ballina, with a dozen other diners, discovered, in the course of the meal, that *they were every one of them Scotch*. At the recent meeting of the British Association at Belfast, the Earl of Mayo made the following statements. He said that—

“Having just returned from the west of Ireland, he could bear his testimony to the work of regeneration having begun in the west in a most remarkable manner. It must be gratifying to every one to know that in the west, taking in Galway and Mayo, Englishmen were coming to reside; and what was most singular was, that they went to the uncultivated and not to the cultivated parts. In one of the wildest parts—at Ballycroy—he found a small cottage inhabited by an English gentleman, and he (Lord Mayo) had the curiosity to ask for what reason he had purchased that particular place. His reply was convincing. He considered that, by buying that uncultivated spot, and paying attention to it, he would be able to double his income in a very short time. The place he had purchased was extremely low, flat, and marshy soil, and yet he had succeeded in cultivating some of it, and intended, in consequence of the success of his experiment, to cultivate more. With respect to other parts of Connemara—say from Westport to Clifden—he was surprised to find the number of houses occupied by persons who were almost all Englishmen; and he might add that even in that wild district a very beautiful shop had been opened. It was a business-establishment almost worthy of Regent-street; and he could not help asking himself, on looking at it, how was an individual so unwise as to set up such a shop there? But no doubt Mr. Ellis, when he bought a place, had calculated well, and he was doing wonders in regenerating the people. If they proceeded further they would still find gentlemen coming and spending their money in these wilds. During the short time he (Lord Mayo) had been there, he met hundreds of English people, and there could be no doubt that property would increase remarkably in value.”

On the same occasion Mr. Locke of Dublin read before the Statistical Section a very interesting analysis of the purchases in the Encumbered Estates Court, from which it appeared that 772 estates had been sold to 2355 purchasers, so that the number of proprietors has more than trebled. The fol-

lowing extracts are very interesting, as showing the amount and distribution of English capital that has lately been invested in Ireland:

ACREAGE AND AMOUNTS PURCHASED BY ENGLISH AND SCOTCH ARRANGED ACCORDING TO PROVINCES.

Provinces.	Acreage.		Purchase-Money.	
	A.	R. P.	£	s. d.
Leinster, - - -	31,012	0 34	222,385	0 0
Munster, - - -	54,342	0 9	362,399	12 6
Ulster, - - -	7,385	0 2	55,922	0 0
Connaught, - - -	310,326	2 9	454,420	0 0
Total, -	403,065	3 14	1,095,126	12 6

“The fourth table shows the localities from whence the purchase-money came:—London and its vicinity, £720,641, 19s. 2d.; Lancashire, (including £39,276, 13s. 4d. from Liverpool and Birkenhead,) £56,526, 13s. 4d.; Buckinghamshire, £1,220; Cheshire, £53,205; Derbyshire, £2,525; Devonshire, £14,445; Durham, £7,750; Gloucestershire, £11,830; Hampshire, £24,400; Hertfordshire, £11,000; Lincolnshire, £5,490; Norfolk, £16,500; Oxfordshire, £6,280; Pembrokehire, £3,820; Suffolk, £5,730; Shropshire, £7,690; Sussex, £7,610; Staffordshire, £57,450; Somersetshire, £2,550; Warwickshire, £5,750; Yorkshire, £3,517; Scotland, £46,220; Calcutta, £24,250; Isle of Man, £1,406; America, £2,320; total, £1,100,126, 12s. 6d. The fifth table shows the number and comparative amounts of English and Scotch purchasers—£1000 and under, 24; £1,000 to £2,000, 18; £2,000 to £5,000, 26; £5,000 to £10,000, 21; £10,000 to £20,000, 13; £20,000 and upwards, 12; total, 114. Of these, one purchaser was from Calcutta, amount, £24,250. Three from the Isle of Man, all under £1,200; and eight from Scotland, viz. one between £2,000 and £5,000, and seven between £5,000 and £10,000.

“The sixth table exhibits, as accurately as can be ascertained, the classification of these purchasers: Gentry, including 8 titled persons, 52; manufacturers and merchants, including 8 firms, 36; insurance and land companies, 6; farmers, 20; total, 114.

“Of the eight purchasers from Scotland, two were gentry, and six farmers. It is a fact of considerable importance, as affecting the improvement of the far west, that English and Scotch purchasers, and tenant farmers also, have usually settled in groups. Thus, 63,000 acres of Sir R. O'Donnell's Mayo estate have been purchased by English capitalists, led by Mr. Ashworth, whose work, entitled ‘The Saxon in Ireland,’ has been of great service to this country. And now a large portion of Erris and the northern shores of Clew Bay is in the possession of Englishmen. Again, in Galway, another set of English purchasers, Messrs. Twining, Eastwood, Palmer, and others, are grouped on the shores of Ballinakill Bay, and in the vale of Kylemore. Many tenant farmers also from the other side of the channel have settled in the western counties within the last three years. Large tracts have been taken on the Marquis of Sligo's estate by English and Scotch gentlemen, and many other landlords in the west have also induced skilful

and enterprising agriculturists to settle on their lands, by granting long and beneficial leases at low rents; but I have no means of arriving at even an approximate estimate of their number; however, it will be observed, upon examination of the foregoing tables, that the greater extent of English and Scotch purchases is in those western districts where the population has been most diminished, and where capital and improvement are chiefly required, three-fourths of the total average being in Galway and Mayo, and two-fifths of the total amount being invested in the same counties. The immigration, too, is confessedly not of an expulsive character, abundance of unoccupied land, perished from water, or the surface of which has been only scratched in scattered patches for centuries, being in the market, and inviting the advent of a more productive system of culture. The number of English and Scotch purchasers, as well as the amount of their purchases, is also steadily on the increase. Up to January 31st of this year the purchases were one-twenty-fifth as to number, and one-tenth as to the total amount of purchase-money. On referring to these tables, we shall find that up to July 31st the proportion as to number is one-twentieth, and as to amount about one-sixth of the total purchase-money."

When this infusion and substitution of a new race—this Celtic exodus and Saxon immigration—shall have continued long enough and proceeded far enough, a large portion of the anomalies which now afflict Ireland will cease, or be reduced within manageable compass. Her present wretchedness and difficulties all spring originally out of two sources—race and religion. A population consisting of seven millions Celts and one million Saxons—seven millions of the conquered and one million of the conquerors—seven millions of dispossessed cultivators fancying, rightly or wrongly, that they were entitled to, and had been wrongfully deprived of, the land held by the single residuary million—might well be difficult to govern. A population—four-fifths of whom looked upon the law as their ruthless oppressor and their natural enemy, who sympathized with the criminal and abetted the crime, who held no oath as binding when the interests of their Church, their race, their party, or their family, could be served by setting it at nought—might well baffle and drive to despair rulers who endeavoured to control and curb them by institutions which can suffice and flourish only among a truth-loving and a law-loving people—by jury-trial, of which the very essence and basis is reliance on the word and oath of jurymen and witnesses—by legal technicalities which seem contrived to secure the escape of the guilty—by a constabulary force which must be nearly powerless when not aided by the general sympathy of the community with peace,

order, and justice. But when the proportions shall have been adequately changed,—when instead of a population of eight millions—of whom seven millions are Irish, we have to deal with four or five millions, of whom half are Britons or of British extraction, the case will be wholly altered, and our difficulties will cease as by magic; the remaining aborigines will not only be controlled by, but will take their tone of feeling and opinion from, the more energetic and right-minded fellow-citizens with whom they are intermingled; as they cease to be criminals and outlaws, the law will become their protector and their friend; it will be easy to find witnesses who will dare and wish to speak the truth, and jurors who will be both able and willing to convict according to the evidence; and for the first time the government of Ireland by British institutions will become a matter not utterly hopeless or impossible.

Another source of grievous embarrassment will also be cleared away. The Irish emigrants are nearly to a man Catholics as well as Celts. The Established Church—which, in its actual proportions, was an indefensible enormity when it was the church of one million out of eight—will lose much of its colossal monstrosity when it has become the church of two millions out of four. And if judicious reform should mitigate even this disproportion, it may well be that as the hostility of race dies out under the process of improvement, juxtaposition, and amalgamation, that of religion may also fade away, and the process of conversion which has already set in at the west of Ireland, may continue with accelerated pace. Those who remain may, with changed circumstances, abandon their old religious creed, as we know is the case with a large proportion of those who have sought a new home in a new world. The Irish who have emigrated to the United States are not fewer than two millions: it is calculated that they and their descendants now number about three millions;* the French,

* These are subjects on which it is impossible to speak with absolute certainty. We are pretty certain that above one million and a-half of Irish have gone to the States in the last twenty-five years. Professor Tucker in 1830 analyzed the white inhabitants of the Union thus:—

English and their descendants,.....	6,000,000
Scotch,.....	500,000
Irish,.....	2,000,000
German,.....	1,000,000
Dutch,.....	500,000
French,.....	300,000
Swedes, Spanish, &c.,.....	200,000
	<hr/> 10,500,000

Another writer, taking the same view, gives the following in 1850:—

Spaniards, and Italians, are estimated at above one million; many of the German emigrants and their descendants are Catholics; yet the total number of Catholics in the Union did not probably in 1850 exceed 2,000,000.*

We confess we have no fear of the emigration from Ireland being carried too far or continued too long. As soon as the inducements become sufficient, English capital, enterprise, and industry, will flock in to fill any gap that made be made, provided only peace and security be established. Englishmen and Scotchmen would seek Ireland as a field both for investment and for speculation, in preference to more distant lands, if life and property were once fully protected.

Anglo-Saxons,.....	11,000,000
Lowland Scotch,.....	700,000
Scotch and Anglo-Saxon Irish,.....	1,500,000
Celtic Irish,.....	2,000,000
Welsh,.....	300,000
German,.....	2,000,000
Dutch,.....	800,000
French,.....	1,000,000
Others,.....	350,000

19,650,000

While this article was passing through the press, we have received from America, by the kindness of Mr. Ticknor and Dr. Chickering, (to whom we take this means of expressing our acknowledgment,) a number of documents bearing on this interesting question, from one of which (the New Englander) we extract another analysis of the American population, evidently made with great care and from the best materials:—

Anglo-Saxons by birth and blood, .	15,000,000
African,	3,594,762
Irish,	2,269,000
German,	1,900,000
French, &c., &c.,	499,736

23,263,498

We are satisfied, however, that this writer underestimates the number of Irish, and probably also of Germans. For example, he gives the total number of immigrants, from all countries, from 1790 to 1850, at 2,759,329. Dr. Chickering, a first authority, however, shows them to amount, in the 33 years ending October 1852, to 3,212,385, of whom 1,597,897 arrived in the last five years.

* On this point, however, we cannot speak with positive certainty. There is no official return of the numbers of different religions. The Catholic Archbishop Hughes, of New York, estimated the number of Catholics in 1850 at 3,000,000. On the other hand, the Catholic Almanac, published under the auspices of Archbishop Eccleston, estimates them only at 1,650,000. The only certain fact is, that their own organs and dignitaries lament bitterly the constant falling away from the old faith of both residents and new arrivals. We have heard of another Archbishop who states the number of Catholics at 1,200,000, (the same as ten years ago), whereas they ought by immigration and natural increase to be at least 5,000,000. The *Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge* published at Philadelphia, gives the number of Catholics of the Union at only 800,000. Again, the *Freeman's Journal* gives a fifth estimate, also a Catholic one, on the authority of a priest, Mr. Mullen, who has lately visited the United States to obtain subscriptions for a Catholic College. He states the number who ought to be Catholic (by emigration and descent) at 3,970,000, and the number who are Catholic at 1,980,000.

The want of this security and this protection has hitherto been the curse and privation of that unhappy country. But Government is, we believe, more alive than it has yet been as to the necessity of performing this, its first duty, at whatever cost; and every emigrant ship that leaves the shores of Ireland makes the task more easy. The first effect of this *immigration*, then, will be, to raise the wages of labour: hitherto the scarcity of hands in many districts, consequent on the exodus, has not had this effect, because the capital in the hands of the employers of labour was so miserably insufficient. The labour-market was scantily supplied, but the labour-fund was scantier still. Hence we have seen the strange anomaly, of a great outcry for workmen, while wages remained at fivepence a-day. The second effect will be a vast increase in the produce of the soil: the old barbarous inefficient modes of tillage will be abandoned, and new ones, at once cheaper and more productive, will be introduced. The early reports of the Poor Law Commissioners stated, that though in Ireland *twice* the number of men were employed per acre, yet that the acreable produce was only *half* what it was in England. When this state of things is rectified, and Irish is assimilated to English agriculture, Irish wages will rapidly approximate to those of England; for the Irish, as we well know, *can* work as hard and as efficiently as Englishmen or Scotchmen, when mixed among them, and directed and stimulated by them. British labour, too, as well as British capital, will flow in to give fresh impetus and introduce a higher standard of exertion. And when the land has become prosperous and peaceful, when wages are at two shillings a day, when labour is at once efficient and well rewarded, and the Poor-House is no longer the only prospect of the peasant, we have no fear that those who then remain will not prefer old Ireland—in its renovated state—to the chances of transatlantic emigration, which by that time may have met with many discouragements. It will be, therefore, with no sorrow or alarm, but, on the contrary, with hope and gratulation, that we shall see the exodus continue at its present rate at all events till the next census—till in fact circumstances have so changed that Ireland has become more attractive than America.

So much for the case of the sister island. Let us now inquire whether the extensive emigration which has set in from Great Britain to the colonies is really such as to afford us any rational cause for alarm, or whether it is not rather a matter for cheer-

fulness and congratulation. Taking the first half of 1852 as the groundwork of our calculation, we find that the total *yearly* number of emigrants from England and Scotland, (allowing for the Irish who have sailed from Liverpool and the Clyde, and the Scotch who have gone by way of Liverpool,) has reached about 116,000, viz., about 96,000 English and 20,000 Scotch. But the annual increase, or surplus of births above deaths, have been in England, on the average of the five years ending 1848, (the last of which we have the returns by us,) 165,000, or nearly one per cent. on the population. If we assume that the same rule holds in Scotland, the annual increase in *Great Britain* by natural multiplication will be about 206,000. If emigration then continues at its present rate, more than half our annual increase will be exported, *leaving* us, however, an annual augmentation of our numbers, of 90,000 souls. Let us tabularize the whole case:—

	England and Scotland.	Ireland.	United Kingdom.
Annual Surplus of Births over Deaths, } An. Emmig'n according to 1st 6 mos. 1852, }	206,000	206,000
	116,000	250,000	366,000
Increase of Population, } Decrease, }	90,000	160,000
	250,000	160,000

In other words; whereas during the last decennial period Ireland lost a *million and a half* of her population, in the next decennial period she will have to face a loss of *two millions and a half*; whereas in the last decade our total increase in Great Britain was *above two millions*, in the next decade it will be *less than one million*; and whereas in the last decade the entire United Kingdom *increased* in population nearly half a million, in the next decade it will *decrease* above a million and a half.* The British Isles have

* It is, however, scarcely probable that the emigration from Great Britain will continue quite at the extreme rate of the present year. Last year it was only 78,000 against (apparently) 116,000 this year. The chief increase has been to Australia—stimulated mainly no doubt by the gold discoveries—as will be seen from the following Table. It may well be, however, that the Saxon emigration to Ireland will counterbalance any diminution of that to Australia:—

Total Emigration from the United Kingdom during the first Six Months.

	U. States.	British N. America.	Australia.	Other Places.	Total.
1847	92,478	86,388	3,448	1,274	183,588
1848	95,651	21,496	7,773	2,161	127,081
1849	132,046	27,691	16,639	2,693	179,069
1850	111,292	20,326	8,564	4,319	144,501
1851	140,336	24,180	8,473	1,871	174,860
1852	136,204	19,453	25,810	1,519	182,986

reached and passed their maximum—in numbers. Such a result may well startle us, and assuredly demands careful consideration.

Nevertheless we look upon the fact as one of no sinister augury, but the contrary—if we are wise and know how to use the golden opportunity. This, however, we are aware, is not the general impression. Many fear that we shall be unable, in such an altered state of things, to find recruits for our army, or sufficient labourers for our fields, or manageable servants for our households, or cheap and efficient artisans to maintain our manufacturing superiority. Let us look at our prospects in these respects *seriatim*.

And first as to our supply of soldiers. These, it is said, have hitherto been chiefly supplied from Ireland and the distressed districts in Scotland, and it is precisely from these quarters that the emigration is the greatest. *The allegation is not true*. Even in the last war it was well known that many of the Highland regiments had comparatively few Highlanders in their ranks. But we have now lying before us returns of the recruits who were inspected in 1845, (an average year,) and we find that of 13,370 7145 were English, 4009 Irish, 2061 Scotch, and the rest Welsh or foreigners. England, therefore, still furnishes more than half, and Great Britain more than two-thirds of our land forces, and nearly all our naval forces.

The total number of British troops may be taken in round figures as averaging 140,000 men—(fewer considerably, we believe, than will in future be found desirable; but let that pass.) The number of recruits annually required appears latterly to have ranged from 10,000 to 20,000—say about 15,000. It is feared that out of a population of twenty-seven millions, which ours now is—still more out of a population of twenty-five millions and a half, (which we are assuming it will be in 1861,) we shall be unable to keep up this army, or to procure this number of recruits. But let us look at what we did in 1806 and 1813, when our population was only *eighteen* millions. In those years our army numbered from 234,000 to 267,000 men, besides which we kept 83,000 regular militia constantly on foot, in addition to the local militia, which numbered from 200,000 to 300,000.* The annual wear and tear of the army was then calculated at 15,000 men in peace, and 25,000 to 30,000 in war; and no difficulty whatever was found in raising the number required by voluntary enlistment.† The same facility of finding voluntary recruits con-

* Alison's History of Europe, x. 172; xviii. 13.

† *Ibid.* x. 173; xviii. 14.

tinued during the whole period of the war; nor can it in any degree be attributed to want of demand for labourers in agricultural and manufacturing occupations. The very contrary was the fact. During nearly the whole of that period, agriculture was notoriously flourishing, and the demand for labour may be in some degree estimated from the fact that from 1804 to 1814, upwards of 1000 Inclosure Acts were passed, and nearly 2,000,000 acres were brought into cultivation.* In the same period our manufacturing industry had also been decidedly though not rapidly on the increase. The official value (or quantity) of British produce and manufactures had risen from £22,000,000 in 1804 to £34,000,000 in 1814; and the declared or real value, from £37,000,000 to £45,000,000.† Now, if under such circumstances, and with a population of only eighteen millions, Great Britain was able to recruit an army of 250,000 men, besides militia, and often to raise 30,000 and 40,000 fresh volunteers every year, we cannot possibly fear that with a population of twenty-six millions, and such numberless inventions for economizing labour, notwithstanding the enormous increase that has taken place in all departments of industry,—we shall find any real difficulty in keeping up an army 150,000 strong, or in finding 15,000 recruits annually, provided only that we really want them, and are willing to offer them adequate inducements to enlist. It is true enough, no doubt, that with trade brisk, and agriculture flourishing, and the colonies clamorous for hands, we shall not be able to procure soldiers *so cheap* as we used to do: the greater the distress, the easier of course is always the task of the recruiting sergeant. But *it will be a mere question of inducement*—pecuniary or otherwise. Our officers will have to compete with a higher rate of wages and more inviting and numerous occupations and outlets than formerly: they will have to bid higher for their men, either in the shape of pay, of treatment, of promotion, or of pensions; but *the article is still there*, if only we are willing to purchase it at its now enhanced value. An improvement in the condition of our troops, and a material increase in their cost, we may unquestionably anticipate.

Secondly, as to agricultural labourers. It is true that it is principally from this class that emigration has hitherto proceeded, and mainly also from this class that our army is

habitually recruited.* Still a little reflection will shew how groundless is the alarm now felt by many, and professed by more, as to the possible insufficiency of the remaining hands for the adequate cultivation of the soil. In the *first* place, we must remind the alarmists, that even if the emigration from Great Britain should continue at its present rate it would still leave us an annual *increase* of nearly 100,000, so that if more hands are annually wanted for agricultural purposes they can be procured. In the *second* place, we may remark, that the rural population in Great Britain generally is at this moment actually redundant, (notwithstanding the inconvenience said to have been felt in some localities at harvest time,) as may be plainly seen, both from the number of able-bodied labourers still wholly or partially dependant on parochial aid‡—greatly as this number has of late years been diminished—and still more from the miserably low wages still current in many of our southern counties. *Thirdly*, the number of hands required for the cultivation of the soil appears to diminish rather than increase as the style and efficiency of agriculture improves. The census returns for 1851 have not yet been analyzed, and those for 1841 were made out in a manner which precluded comparison with any former year.‡ But if we can trust the returns for 1821 and 1831, there was an actual *diminution* in the number of families employed in agriculture, in England from 773,732 to 761,348, and in Scotland from 130,699 to 126,591; and this diminution took place although 200 inclosure Acts had been passed, and about 400,000 acres of fresh land had been brought into cultivation.¶ It appears then that we have already more hands than are needed in agricultural occupations; that the number needed is further progressively diminishing; and that if more were needed they could still be had. It is true, no doubt, that when the various crops ripen simultaneously, some difficulty may be experienced

* Occupation of Recruits inspected in 1845:—

Husbandmen, Labourers, &c.,	8,277
Mechanical Trades,	4,083
Shopmen and Clerks,	982
Professional,	28

13,370

† On January 1, 1850, 172,800. On January 1, 1851, 147,500.

‡ The number of *individuals* given in the census returns of 1841 as engaged in agriculture in Great Britain in 1841, was 1,500,000, to which M'Culloch adds 800,000 as engaged in subsidiary trades, making a total of 2,300,000. But we cannot regard these figures as very reliable.

¶ Porter's Progress of the Nation, i. 52, &c.

* Porter's Progress of the Nation, i. 156, 171.

† *Ibid.* ii. 98.

—which was not felt formerly—in procuring the extra hands necessary to harvest them; but what does this mean but that *hitherto we have maintained a large population in costly idleness for eleven months in the year, in order to have their labour in the one remaining month*, and that in future we shall not be able to do so—a result which is surely a matter for congratulation in both an economical and a philanthropic point of view. We know well that scarcity or dearness of labour is the great stimulus to the introduction of improved processes and mechanical contrivances; and when the farmer finds that he can no longer have so many hands as he wants, exactly when he wants them, and nearly on the terms which it may suit him to pay, labour will be economized and rendered efficient, reaping machines and thrashing machines will soon come into general use, and new and improved tools will be substituted for those which have so long satisfied that stationary and unenterprising race. That wages will rise in the rural districts there can, we think, be no question; we should be grieved if it were not so: the fact of heads of families receiving only 7s. and 8s. a week, (and that not regularly,) is precisely one of those monstrous evils and anomalies for which emigration is the appointed cure. But it by no means follows that the farmer will suffer in consequence, or that the cost of raising agricultural produce will be enhanced thereby: we believe the contrary will be the result. For not only will the labour of the well-paid man be more efficient and valuable than that of the pauperized and ill-fed rustic, (as is even now found to be the case by the more skilful and energetic farmers of Leicestershire and Lincolnshire,) but the improvements consequent upon the necessity of economizing labour will give a stimulus to agriculture which it has long wanted. Moreover, the same operation which makes labour scarce and dear will make the poor-rates light; and if the opportunity is used as we trust it may be, the heaviest and most irritating burden of the farmer may be removed. He will pay his labourers higher, but will employ fewer of them; his outgoings (in rates) will be much less than now, and his crops will be improved both in quantity and quality.

Thirdly. It is feared that our manufacturing progress will be arrested, and our manufacturing superiority be jeopardized by the enormous emigration from our shores. Hitherto, it is alleged, we have been enabled to keep down the cost of production, to force our productions into every

market, and to undersell all competitors, in consequence of the abundant supply of labour which we have been able to command. The whole increase of the rural districts has flocked into our industrial towns; Ireland has poured her superfluous numbers into Lancashire and Lanarkshire, and even Yorkshire has had her share. On the cost of manufacturing production depends the whole question of our successful commercial rivalry with other nations:—if that should be materially enhanced—nay, if it should not be progressively diminished as other producing nations diminish theirs, we shall be defeated in the contest; and already our competitors are everywhere treading close upon our heels. Now, mechanical improvements have gone on and are going on in all branches of our manufactures (unlike the case of agriculture) as fast as avarice or ambition could stimulate our ingenuity; we can hope for no accelerated advance in this line; and in all these improvements our rivals participate as fully as ourselves. The whole question therefore, has become one of a cheap and abundant supply of labour—precisely the thing which the wholesale exodus you are rejoicing over threatens to destroy.

We will concede at once that the effect of emigration will necessarily be to enhance the general wages of labour, and to diminish the supply, *or rather to prevent those wages falling as they must otherwise have done.* *Pro tanto*, and as far as it goes, it will counteract the operation of the repeal of the Corn Laws, which was, *first*, to equalize (or approximate) the wages of labour here and on the continent; and, *secondly*, not indeed to lower them here at once, but to make it possible to lower them, if at any future time the relation between demand and supply in the labour market should render such reduction just and necessary. The effect of emigration will, therefore, probably be to keep the rate of wages permanently higher here than in those continental countries which have not our facilities of outlet for their increasing population; and moreover, there can be no doubt that the rate of wages is one of the most important elements in the cost of manufacturing production. But *it is only one*; and it is precisely that one in which we have never had an advantage—in which we have been always at a disadvantage;—*in despite of our disadvantage in which our manufacturing superiority has been earned and maintained.* Our advantages have been, *first*, in more excellent machinery: this we are fast losing, if we have not already lost it; *secondly*, in greater concen-

tration; this we still maintain;—*thirdly*, in the greater energy of our people: which diminishes yearly as other nations improve; and *fourthly*, in our abundance of capital and our low interest of money, and the consequent low profits for which our capitalists are willing to work: an advantage which certainly there is at present no appearance of our losing. It is only of late that as foreign competition has become closer and more menacing, and as the hours of labour have been reduced by legislative enactments, that we have begun to look anxiously to the possibility of reduced wages of labour as necessary to enable us to hold our ground. Moreover, it is worthy of remark, that our most formidable rivals, the Americans, are precisely the only ones who have *no advantage* over us in the price of labour; and that our most formidable European rivals, the Swiss, are those who have *least advantage* over us in this item of expense.

But again: Is there any reason to fear that the annual increase of our united population *left at home*—amounting, be it remembered, to nearly 100,000—will not be sufficient to supply the demands made upon it by the supposed annual increase of our manufacturing industry? We have no certain knowledge of the actual numbers now employed in the various branches of manufactures in Great Britain;* but the following is Mr. McCulloch's estimate of the principal ones, and we have no reason to believe it is far from the truth. It relates to the year 1845.

Number employed in the coal trade and manufacture,	177,000
" " Iron,	100,000
" " Tin, copper, &c.,	70,000
" " Lead (say conjecture,)	50,000
" " Woollen,	300,000
" " Cotton,	550,000
" " Silk,	35,000
" " Linen,	85,000
" " Hardware,	275,000
" " Leather,	290,000
	1,932,000
Add for sundry manufactures,	63,000
	2,000,000
Add increase for seven years at 2 per cent., say,	300,000
Number now employed in manufacturing occupations,	2,300,000

Now, we have no accurate means of knowing the rate of annual increase in the number of hands employed in our various manufactures, nor even in the production in any one. It is, however, generally believed, that the cotton trade is that which increases most rapidly, and it is that also whose increase we can most exactly ascertain, as all the raw

material used up is imported, and therefore accurately registered. Now, on an average of a number of years, and in round numbers, the quantity of raw cotton imported into Great Britain has increased at about the same rate as the negro population of America, (whence our chief supply is derived,) or three per cent. But, as is well known, both labour and machinery are much more efficient than formerly; a given weight of raw cotton does not require nearly the same number of hands to manufacture it as it used to do. If, therefore, we assume *two* per cent. as the increase in the labour required in the cotton trade, we shall probably be up to the mark; and if we assume that the other manufactures increase as fast as the cotton, we shall certainly be beyond the mark. Now, two per cent. on 2,300,000 persons is 46,000 a year. If, therefore, all our manufactures should increase as fast as that of cotton, and if the cotton manufacture should increase as fast as it has done for the last fifteen years,—altogether they would only require half the annual increase that remains in these islands after emigration has done its worst.*

But further;—is it necessary that our manufactures *should* increase in the same ratio as hitherto, or is it likely that they *will*? If indeed England could become, what it has always been her ambition to be—the great workshop of the world; if even it were at all probable that she could remain so much as she is at present,—we might then rationally enough look with some uneasiness upon the expatriation of so large a number of those sons through whom she was to maintain her manufacturing supremacy. But those who are intimate with the condition and history of our industrial progress, have long been aware that these hopes are utterly delusive. It is true that till now we have gone on increasing our production and our exports, because the world has been growing wealthier, our customers have been

* It will, we hope, be borne in mind that we give these figures and calculations only as conjectural estimates, and with a strong impression of the uncertainty of all similar data; but they will at all events aid us in our search after the truth. Many will be startled by the reflection, "if our manufactures have hitherto absorbed only 46,000 a year of our annual increase of 200,000, what has become of the remainder?" We confess our inability to answer this question; we can only observe that whereas we have estimated our manufacturing population to increase at the rate of *two* per cent., our total population has increased at the rate of little more than one per cent. per annum. Our impression is very strong, that 100,000 additional persons every year are quite as many as we shall be able to find occupation for at home, without overstocking still further trades and professions that are already overstocked, and keeping the standard of living at an undesirably low point.

* The census of 1841 gives 3,110,000 as engaged in commerce, trade, and manufactures, but this will include all shopkeepers, merchants, &c.

multiplying, and new markets have been opening to us as fast as old markets have closed,—but this cannot always continue at the same rate as formerly. We have now many rivals, where thirty years ago we had none; we formerly supplied nations which now partially or entirely manufacture for themselves;* we formerly had the monopoly of many markets, where we are now met and undersold by younger competitors. To several quarters we now send only that portion of their whole demand which our rivals are at present unable to supply. A far larger proportion of our production, now than formerly, is exported to distant and unproducing countries. A far larger proportion, now than formerly, is exported to our own Colonies, and our remote possessions. More relatively is sent to Asia and America, and less to Europe. Countries which we formerly supplied with the finished article, now take from us only the half-finished article or the raw material. Austria meets us in Italy; Switzerland and Germany meet us in America; the United

States meet us in Brazil and in China. We formerly sent yarn to Russia: we now send cotton-wool. We formerly sent chiefly plain and printed calicoes to Germany: we now send mainly the yarn for making them. All these countries produce more cheaply than we do;—but as yet they are not producing *enough*: we therefore *supplement* them. Partly by our old restriction system, partly by the natural effect of an increasing population, they have been driven from the plough to the loom,—or have been driven to add the loom to the plough; and henceforth our manufacturing production can increase only, not by underselling or successfully competing with our rivals, but by *the demand of the world increasing faster than our rivals can supply it*. This is more or less the case with all our principal manufactures: it is pre-eminently the case with our chief manufacture, the cotton. The following tables relating to our cotton manufactures will bear out the statements we have just made:—

TABLE I.—*Shewing the Exports in 1840 and 1851, to European Producing Countries, now our rivals, of the half-manufactured, the manufactured, and the finished article, i. e., Cotton Yarn, Plain Calicoes, and Ornamental or Finished Calicoes.*

COUNTRIES.	COTTON YARN—Lbs.		PLAIN CALICOES—YARDS.		PRINTED AND DYED CALICOES—YARDS.	
	1840.	1851.	1840.	1851.	1840.	1851.
Russia,	16,884,000	3,073,000	1,685,000	1,501,000	428,000	439,000
Germany,— (Prussia, Holland, Germany, Belgium,) }	63,591,000	62,232,000	27,673,000	32,173,000	46,443,000	39,948,000
France,	76,000	72,000	1,182,000	1,348,000	1,656,000	1,713,000
	80,551,000	65,377,000	30,540,000	35,022,000	48,527,000	42,100,000

This Table shews, that, in spite of a considerable increase of population and consumption, the chief countries of Europe, now become manufacturers themselves, take from us *less* than formerly.

* The following comparison, taken from the circular (Oct. 1852) of Messrs. Dufay and Co., (quite the first authorities on such matters,) will shew how far other countries are treading on our heels in the cotton manufacture.

Consumption of Raw Cotton by the following Countries—given in millions of lbs.

	1836-7-8.	Per cent. of the whole.	1849-50-51.	Per cent. of the whole.	Rate of Increase since 1837.
Great Britain,	1154	56.6	1859	52.6	61
Russia, Germany, Holland, Belgium }	178	8.6	411	11.6	133
Other continental countries, . . . }	449	22.0	711	20.1	58
United States, . . . }	260	12.8	551	15.7	112
Total,	2039	100*	3532	100.	73

The comparison of 1852 will be still more against this country.

Something of the same process seems to be going on in the wool trade. The Belgian manufacturers are now competing, on more than equal terms, with the Leeds clothiers; and the following figures will give us an idea of the increase of the continental manufacture:—

Export of Foreign and Colonial Wool from Great Britain.

1848,	6,575,000 lbs.
1850,	14,054,000 "

Export of British Wools.

1848,	3,978,000 lbs.
1849,	11,200,000 "
1850,	12,002,000 "
1851,	8,517,000 "

In this year an immense increase has taken place.

First 8 months of 1851, . . .	5,215,000 lbs.
Do. do., 1852, . . .	0,203,000 "

TABLE II.—Shewing the proportion of our Cotton Exports taken by Europe, Asia, America, and our Colonies.

	COTTON YARNS—Lbs.			PLAIN CALICOES—Yards.			PRINTED AND DYED CALICOES—Yards.		
	1840.	1851.	Increase per cent.	1840.	1851.	Increase per cent.	1840.	1851.	Increase per cent.
Europe,	94,013,000	88,295,000	(Decrease) 6	99,347,000	126,838,000	28	107,304,000	94,878,000	(Decrease) 12
Greece, Turkey, Levant, and N. Africa,*	4,630,000	10,239,000	(Increase) 121	41,015,000	82,776,000	101	26,586,000	47,784,000	(Increase) 80
East Indian Territories,	16,014,000	23,772,000	(Increase) 48	115,217,000	284,205,000	147	29,866,000	38,227,000	28
China, Java, Sumatra, &c.,	2,681,000	5,582,000	(Increase) 119	23,015,000	150,563,000	550	6,867,000	33,300,000	385
United States,	265,000	181,000	(Decrease) 32	8,827,000	16,864,000	91	23,246,000	47,263,000	102
S. America and Foreign West Indies,	440,000	391,000	(Decrease) 11	99,041,000	150,094,000	53	97,503,000	159,715,000	64
† Our own Colonies, out of Europe,	666,000	577,000	(Decrease) 14	44,966,000	45,627,000	1½	62,093,000	60,705,000	(Decrease) 2
Our own Colonies, excluding the West Indies,	490,000	563,000	(Increase) 15	19,132,000	29,055,000	55	29,600,000	40,280,000	(Increase) 36

This Table shews an actual diminution in our exports to Europe; an increase to more distant quarters, and newer markets, varying from 48 to 550 per cent.; and an increase to our own colonies (excepting the West Indies, which we have wilfully thrown to the dogs) of from 15 to 55 per cent.

* Including Malta and Ionian Islands.

† Including West Coast of Africa.

TABLE III.—*Shewing the declared value of British Exports to different quarters of the world in 1830, 1840, 1845 and 1850, and the proportion of total Exports sent to each division.*

QUARTERS OF THE WORLD.	1830.	Per Centage.	1840.	Per Centage.	1845.	Per Centage.	1850.	Per Centage.
Europe,	£14,415,000	38	£19,713,000	39½	£22,651,000	39	£23,150,000	33
Greece, Turkey, Levant, &c.,*	1,507,000	4	1,785,000	3½	3,600,000	6	4,470,000	6½
East Indian Territories,	3,270,000	8	6,023,000	12	6,704,000	11½	8,022,000	11½
China, Java, Sumatra, &c.,	870,000	2	1,200,000	2½	3,026,000	5	2,275,000	3
United States of America,	6,132,000	16	5,283,000	10½	7,148,000	12	14,805,000	21
South and Central America and Foreign West Indies,	6,128,000	16	6,202,000	12½	6,443,000	11	7,825,000	11
British West Indies,	2,838,000	8	3,575,000	7½	2,789,000	4½	2,213,000	3
Our other Colonies (out of Europe),†	2,955,000	8	5,718,000	11½	6,311,000	10½	7,574,000	11
Total,	£38,115,000	100	£49,499,000	100	£58,672,000	100	£70,437,000	100

* Including Malta, Ionian Islands, and N. Africa.

† Including West coast of Africa.

Now, a careful consideration of these Tables will shew, that unless we could continue to extend our distant and colonial markets as fast or faster than we have done of late years, which even the most sanguine among us could scarcely hope for, we should ere long have been driven to seek some other provision for our increasing population than that which our manufactures have hitherto afforded them. We should have been compelled either to *create new markets*, or to lessen the numbers (or forbid their increase) who worked for the supply of foreign markets. The advantage of emigration is that it *affects both these operations*—more especially when directed to our own colonies. It diminishes or tends to check the increase of the number of producers at home, and it augments the number of consumers abroad. It checks production and multiplies markets. It increases the demand and checks the increase of the supply. The weaver, who at home was obliged, in order to maintain himself, to make calicoes for which it was often difficult to find a customer, now goes to Australia and becomes a customer himself. He *consumes* instead of *producing*: a shirt more is wanted, and a shirt less is made. Hence emigration is a double safeguard against those periods of glut and “over-production,” of which we have seen so many in the last twenty years. The following Table is interesting, as showing how much better customers for British productions our own colonists are than foreigners. We cannot guarantee its *minute* correctness, because it is difficult to obtain with perfect accuracy the population of different states for particular years; but we believe it will be found a pretty fair approximation to the truth, and it is compiled from the most authentic documents.

TABLE IV.

COUNTRIES.	Population in 1849.	Consumption of British Produce and Manufactures in 1850.	Consumption per head in shillings.
China,	250,000,000	£1,575,000	·12
E. Indian Ter.	150,000,000	8,023,000	1·06
Europe,	230,000,000	23,000,000	2·0
United States,	23,000,000	14,802,000	12·9
N. Amer. Col.	2,280,000	3,235,000	28·3
Australian Col.	380,000	2,600,000	137·0

But, finally, even supposing that the emigration from these islands should continue so extensive as altogether to change the conditions of the labour market, to check our manufacturing increase, and endanger our manufacturing supremacy, is not the alarm felt at this prospect rather a consequence of mistaking the means for the end, than well-grounded and rational? No one imagines that there will not always be an ample supply of hands to maintain existing establishments: the evil apprehended is that, by draining off in a different direction the crowds which have hitherto pressed into the labour market, the rate of wages in this country will be materially enhanced, so that our manufacturers will no longer be able to produce as cheaply as formerly, nor therefore to extend as rapidly, or compete with rival nations as successfully as of yore. But what is the object of our manufacturing industry? What hitherto has made the steady increase of that industry a matter of vital and first-rate moment to us? Clearly, to provide employment and subsistence for our advancing population. But if that necessity no longer exist—if that object is provided for in another way—if our working-classes find elsewhere more lucrative employment and easier subsistence,—where, in a national point of view, is the reason for regret or fear? The increased rate of wages, which

is the real object of our alarm, can only arise from the improved prospects, the enlarged openings, the raised condition, of our labouring poor:—it therefore simply indicates that they have obtained, through another channel, the advantages which it was the aim and purpose of our manufacturing activity to secure to them. The increased rate of wages, which enhances the cost of our productions, and therefore *ceteris paribus*, limits the markets for them, is the consequence of a state of things which makes extended markets, *pro tanto*, less necessary than they were. The moment that an extension of our manufactures becomes again wanted in order to afford employment for our artisans—either in consequence of their multiplication, or of the new fields of employment closing upon them or being filled up—that moment will wages naturally fall, the cost of production be again reduced, and manufactured articles again force themselves an outlet. This or that manufacturer may be inconvenienced; this or that branch of our industry may be temporarily deranged; great changes may take place in the distribution of employments; but as the sole object of industry is to earn the necessities and comforts of life—as the sole benefit of brisk and advancing trade is to afford ample and regular reward to those engaged in it,—*then if these objects are already present and attained—as the fact of high wages show that they are*—what more can we, as a people, desire? As soon as the check given, or expected to be given, to manufacturing activity, by scanty and high priced labour, becomes a national evil, labour will immediately and inevitably cease to be—or rather will have ceased to be—either scanty or high priced.

Why, in the vast majority of cases, do wages rise? Because labour has become more productive. Why are hands difficult to be procured for one trade? Because they are in greater demand—more highly tempted—that is, more productive in another. If, indeed, depopulation were going on to such an extent that manufacturing capital, already invested and fixed, were in danger of being thrown idle for want of hands to work it, then an actual loss of property might be deplored. But no one conceives that this will be the case. All that is feared is that we shall not be able to invest *more* capital or find *more* hands (on the old terms) for an increase of our production. But why? Simply and obviously because this capital and these hands find more tempting occupation elsewhere, and in some other line. Instead of producing calico here at 7 per cent. profit, and 10s. a-week wages, they are producing corn or

wool at the antipodes, at 20 per cent. profit, and £3 a-week wages.* If the whole of our emigrating capital and labour went to our own colonies, there could be no doubt about the matter: the aggregate community would be benefited and enriched precisely in the degree in which the new field of industry was more productive than the old one. “But a large proportion of our emigrants go to America.” Very true: what is the result? The British capital, which otherwise would have employed them here, partially and with difficulty, will follow and find them employment in more productive occupations, and therefore at a higher rate of profit at the other side of the Atlantic. Merchants are well aware of the enormous and increasing amount of English money now employed in America. At the moment we are writing we have received much curious information as to the extent to which Americans are endeavouring, (and succeeding,) as in 1836, to carry on their business with British capital.

So far, then, from being disposed to augur ill to Great Britain from the extent of this Modern Exodus, we augur from it the greatest and the widest good. We see in it an opening for a splendid and a happy future such as has rarely, if ever, been vouchsafed to an old country. We see in it the solution of most of our social difficulties, the cure of many of our social sores. It will supersede, render superfluous, and scatter to the winds all wild and foolish theories for national regeneration, and render practicable many sane and sober ones. Viewed aright, and used aright, it should be the commencement of a new era, richer, lovelier, nobler, and grander, than any previous epoch of our history. It is one of those critical “tides in the affairs of men, which, taken at the flood lead on to fortune”—one of those glorious opportunities which, if neglected, Providence offers not again; which, if promptly seized, and judiciously and diligently turned to account, need no second advent. Let us briefly hint at a few of the consequences which it will or may produce.

1. It will greatly check and reduce within

* Many, we believe, fear that wages may rise so high that all the manufacturer's profit will be swept away, and he will no longer therefore be able to employ his people. But it is obvious that this can never be the case, (except partially and momentarily.) For it is only the manufacturer's profit that enables him to employ people or to pay wages at all. The moment that profit ceases, or falls so low as to be no inducement to carry on business, he ceases to be able to employ the people or to pay them. Employment then immediately becomes *wanted*, and wages necessarily fall, till the margin of profit is again large enough to induce the resumption of production.

beneficent limits, if not altogether terminate Irish Immigration into England. For half a century back the western shores of our island—especially Lancashire and Glasgow—have been flooded with crowds of half-clad, half-fed, half-civilized Celts, many thousands of whom have settled permanently in our manufacturing towns, reducing wages by their competition, and what is far worse, reducing the standard of living and comfort among our people by their example—spreading squalor and disease by their filthy habits—inciting to turbulence and discontent by their incorrigible hostility to law—incalculably increasing the burden of our poor-rates—and swelling the registers of crime both in police courts and assizes, to the great damage of the national character and reputation. The abundant supply of cheap labour which they furnished had no doubt the effect of enabling our manufacturing industry to increase at a rate and to reach a height which, without them, would have been unattainable; and so far they have been of service. In every other respect the Celtic settlers in the west of England have been a source of unmixed evil. We have taken considerable pains to collect a few facts which may serve as a specimen of the extent to which Irish immigration really swells the burden of British pauperism and the returns of British crime. Here are some of them:—

First. We have a carefully prepared document lying before us, from which it appears that in the three years, from November 3, 1848, to October 12, 1851, (omitting a period of nine weeks during which no account was kept,) the number of *deck passengers* arriving in Liverpool from Ireland, was 756,674, of which 531,459 were emigrants and jobbers, and 225,205, or *nearly a quarter of a million, were paupers.*

Secondly. The number of paupers passed back to Ireland by the Liverpool overseers, having become chargeable on that parish, were in

1847, . . .	15,008
1848, . . .	7607
1849, . . .	9507
1850, . . .	8012 at a cost of £1386.
1851, . . .	8800 " " 2120.

In addition to this, the Chairman of the Board of Guardians stated, (in 1851,) that £15,000 was expended annually in relief to Irish paupers.

Thirdly. We have lying before us a report made to the Manchester Board of Guardians by their clerk, Mr. Harrop, from which it appears that while in five years, from 1846 to 1851, the *English* paupers in that union receiving out-door relief, have increased only from 2463 to 2624 families, or less than *seven per cent.*, and in total cost only £7, 10s. a week, the Irish paupers have increased from 427 to 1478 families, or more than *three hundred per cent.*, and in total cost £132 weekly, or £6864 per annum!

Fourthly. The number of cases relieved by the District Provident Society of Liverpool in 1843 and 1844, (before the famine, observe,) were 36,403, of which 19,102, or *more than half were Irish.*

Fifthly. The returns of our assize courts do not unfortunately discriminate the native country of the criminals brought before them, but the police courts of Manchester and Liverpool supply us with a standard of comparison.

Return shewing the Number of Persons taken into Custody for Offences committed in the Borough of Manchester in 1850.

COUNTRY OF OFFENDER.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Per cent. age of the whole.
England,	2393	795	3188	69·64
Ireland,	778	446	1224	26·73
Scotland,	64	29	93	2·04
Wales,	32	21	53	1·16
Foreigners,	13	7	20	·44
Total,	3280	1298	4578	100·00

A Return shewing the Number of Prisoners brought before the Magistrates for the Borough of Liverpool, distinguishing the different Countries to which they belong, during the following Years:—

COUNTRY.	1848.			1849.			1850.		
	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.	Males.	Females.	Total.
Liverpool,	2,862	1,607	4,469	3,043	1,776	4,819
English,	7,138	3,650	10,788	3,228	1,401	4,629	3,237	1,403	4,640
Irish,	5,280	3,514	8,794	4,823	3,301	8,124	4,550	3,432	7,982
Scotch,	644	243	887	617	207	824	620	225	845
Welsh,	519	265	784	455	231	686	533	261	794
Manx,	128	25	153	60	52	112	79	37	116
Foreigners,	607	23	630	618	25	643	637	18	655
Total,	14,316	7,720	22,036	12,663	6,824	19,487	12,699	7,152	19,851

Sixthly. The number of low lodging-houses in the borough of Manchester (sinks of vice and crime of every sort) are 358, containing 1017 rooms, and 1953 beds, and tenanted, on an average, by 3544 lodgers every night. The persons who keep these lodging abominations are,—

English,	91
Irish,	252
Scotch,	5
Foreigners,	10

—
358

2. Of the effect which our wholesale emigration will produce on the long depressed agricultural population, we have already spoken. If the advance in their earnings, and the improvement in their position, should, as we trust it will, raise their standard of comfort and of wants, instead of merely inducing them to add recklessly to their numbers, their condition may be permanently and incalculably elevated. The effect will be still more marked on the *classes dangereuses*—the distressed, reproachful and criminal classes—of our great towns. Numbers of those tailors, bootmakers, and needlewomen, of whose redundant multitudes and severe sufferings we have of late years heard so much, will no doubt emigrate themselves. Many have already done so, some through Lord Ashley's aid, and some through that of Sidney Herbert's society. Numbers more will emigrate out of the class from which these superabundant handicraftsmen have hitherto been recruited. By the combined operation they will, we may fairly hope, soon cease to be too numerous for the requirements of the community: Fifteen thousand tailors may find full employment where twenty-three thousand could only become slaves of the "sweaters," or crush each other in the internecine strife. We shall no longer hear—at least we ought not—of thousands driven into habitual theft, from the impossibility of finding any honest means of maintenance; of thousands more compelled to seek in prostitution the required addition to the scanty earnings of the needle. That "unrestricted competition," so beneficent in its healthy and natural results, so crushing to the weak when the labour market has become filled up, and yet when labourers persist in crowding into it as before—so hateful to benevolent theorists, who regard it only in its more superficial workings, and its more anomalous results, and have not insight enough, or faith enough, to trace "a blessing in disguise,"—that "unrestricted competition," which it has been of late the fashion so passionately to denounce, will again appear in its true

shape, as at once a salutary stimulant, a natural check, a trustworthy and self-operating guide. We shall no longer be inundated with well-meant but ill-digested schemes for setting artificial contrivances to check-mate natural laws, and for purchasing a bureaucratic utopia by the sacrifice of individual free action. Socialism, Communism, elaborate and magnificent schemes of association—*le droit au travail*—will all disappear with that disordered condition of "the demand and supply of labour," which alone gave birth to them, or could secure them a moment's currency; the axe will have been laid to the *root* of the tree; the evil, which could never have been checked by assaults on its secondary and symptomatic operations, will have been assailed and extinguished at its *source*.

3. The diminution of our population, and the consequent lightening of the pressure in all branches of industry, will probably go far to rectify what has been pointed out as a very serious evil by our first living political economist, J. S. Mill, viz., the disproportionate and needless numbers employed in the work, not of production, but of *distribution* of the productions of others. The number of retail traders and shopkeepers is out of all proportion to the requirements of society, or the numbers of the producing classes. There are in many places ten shopkeepers to do the work which one would suffice for—such at least is Mr. Mill's estimate. Now these men, industrious and energetic as they are, do not add to the production, and therefore not to the wealth, of the community; they merely distribute what others produce. Nay more, in proportion as they are too numerous, do they diminish the wealth of the community. They live, it is true, many of them, by "snatching the bread out of each other's mouths;" but still they *do* live and often make great profits. These profits are made, it is obvious, by charging a per centage on the article they sell. If therefore there are *two* of these retailers to be supported by a community, when *one* would suffice to do the work, the articles they sell must cost that community more than need to be the case, and so far the country is impoverished by supporting an "unproductive labourer" too many. Any one who examines into the subject is surprised to find how small a portion of the price paid by the consumer for any article goes to the *producer* or importer, and how large a portion is absorbed by the distributor.* But these retailers are pre-

* "I think any one who has had occasion to inquire, in particular cases, what portion of the price paid at a shop for an article really goes to the per-

cisely the class of partially educated, shrewd, energetic men, to whom a new colony, as soon as colonization has been made attractive and customary, will be most inviting, and are peculiarly well fitted to thrive there.

4. Emigration will give us such an opportunity as probably no nation has ever yet been blessed with, of retracing our many fatal false steps on the subject of pauperism, and placing, once for all, our entire Poor-Law system on a sound, innocuous, and defensible foundation. A poor-law which taxes the industrious for the support of the idle—the frugal and provident for the sake of the wasteful and improvident—those who have accumulated property by diligence and self-denial for the behoof of those whom fecklessness and self-indulgence have kept poor—is, considered *per se*, a curse to a country, not a blessing—a sin, not a virtue, in those who have enacted it. To compel the man who has kept himself above poverty by abstaining from marriage to maintain the wife and children of the man who by marriage has sunk himself in destitution, is a monstrous injustice—a clear and crying impolicy. One only circumstance can make such a poor-law as ours *not* unjust as well as not unwise; and that is where it is obligatory upon us as a compensation for previous injustice. Where destitution has been caused by the sole fault or misfortune of the destitute, a poor-law—*i.e.* compulsory charity—is, we conceive, wholly indefensible. But where pauperism and destitution have been caused or stimulated by bad laws, by unjust social arrangements, by the sin of the community in short, then the indigent and incapacitated have a claim on public aid, *not as an inherent right, but as compensation for*

a committed wrong. Now, this unquestionably has hitherto been our case. By our corn-laws, which enhanced the price of food—by our restrictive commercial policy, which curtailed the demand for labour—by our old legislative and administrative follies, which stimulated multiplication, and thus unnaturally increased the supply of labour—by our false doctrines and neglected duties which taught the people error, and did not educate them till they could perceive the truth, on subjects which directly bore upon their social condition—we wronged them, and made ourselves responsible for much of their poverty and incapacity. As far then, and as long, as we had caused or aided their pauperism, we were morally bound to endure it and relieve it. But now we have abjured our blunders, and retraced our steps. We have done much towards educating the people in better habits and in sounder views. We no longer stimulate population by parish allowances regulated according to the multitude of children. We have removed all restrictions on trade, and all taxes on food. The working classes have now, in all respects, fair play. In future,—*i.e.*, as soon as the destitution we have caused shall have died out, and the superabundant population we have tempted into life shall have been absorbed,—the only *claim* of the poor upon the rich for compulsory aid will have been cancelled. And of the mischievous and demoralizing effect of a poor-law, when no longer demanded by justice, nearly every man with whom we need to reason is painfully convinced. As soon, therefore, as the demand for labour has overtaken the supply, and there can, in consequence, be no able-bodied pauperism which is not voluntary and wilful, the moral claim of the able-bodied to relief ceases, and their legal claim should cease also. But with the claim of the able-bodied, the claim of the aged and infirm ceases too. For they are a natural and providentially ordered burden, not upon the community, but on their relatives. The able-bodied man ought by the law of Nature; and is enabled by the power which Nature has given him, to support not only himself, but those dependent on him. And the moment ample work and wages are at the command of the able-bodied, that moment does the maintenance of *his* children, *his* sick, *his* disabled, devolve upon him. *That moment emigration has now brought, or will probably bring.* And if our legislators do not seize the happy opportunity to undo a great evil, to amend an enormous blunder, to repeal a most disastrous, paralyzing, and corrupting enactment, on them, and no

son who made it, must have been astonished to find how small it is. It is of great importance to consider the cause of this. . . . It does not arise from the extravagant remuneration of capital. I think it proceeds from two causes: one of them is, the very great, I may say, the *extravagant portion of the whole produce of the community which now goes to mere distributors*; the immense amount that is taken up by the different classes of dealers, and especially by retailers. Competition has, no doubt, some tendency to reduce this rate of remuneration: still I am afraid that, in most cases, and looking at it as a whole, the effect of competition is, as in the case of the fees of professional people, rather to divide the amount among a larger number, and so diminish the share of each, than to lower the scale of what is obtained by the class generally." "If the business of distribution, which now employs, taking the different classes of dealers and their families, perhaps more than a million of the inhabitants of this country, could be done by a hundred thousand people, I should think the other nine hundred thousand could be dispensed with."—*J. S. Mill: Evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, 6th June, 1850.*

longer on inevitable circumstance or on ancestral fault, will lie a terrible responsibility and an ample penalty.

5. The great stimulus that our extensive emigration will give to every branch of the shipping interest must not be overlooked. According to M'Culloch, (*British Empire*, ii. 71,) the registered amount of British and Irish tonnage (above fifty tons, and such vessels only are used in ocean voyages) was in 1845, 2,856,000. It is certainly now not less than 3,000,000. Now, since each ship carrying emigrants to America can make about three voyages in the year on an average—and each one sailing to Australia can make one voyage, out and home, every year; then since the Passengers' Act limits the number to be taken to one person to every two tons; and since, in round numbers, about 50,000 go to Australia and 300,000 to America, we arrive at the fact, that the emigrant business alone gives full employment to 300,000 tons of shipping, or ten per cent. of our whole mercantile navy, independent of the coasting trade.*

6. The effect of emigration in relieving the overstocked professions—the Church, the Bar, the Army, and the Medical Profession—seems at first sight scarcely likely to be so powerful as its operation in other directions. But we are disposed to think that this is merely a question of time and directness. It is very true that comparatively few of those now engaged in, or intended for, the learned professions, are likely to emigrate, or to make good emigrants. On the other hand, some of the most energetic and successful emigrants have been officers of the army and navy. And though many physicians, clergymen, and lawyers may not go out, yet as soon as, under proper management, the colonies become as attractive as they might be made, ought to be made, and, we believe, soon will be made, numbers of those whom the lack of any other eligible outlet now forces into the learned professions, will direct their prospects into the more hopeful channel of colonisation. They will early be taught to look to that as their line of life, and will qualify themselves for it accordingly; and thus the professions will yearly become less crowded, not because many will leave them, but because fewer will flock into them. In addition to this, the vacancies made by the emigration

of the more energetic classes below them, who now monopolize such situations as clerkship, railway officials, &c., will make an opening for them. On the whole, we are inclined to hope that the higher and middle classes may ultimately feel the relief as sensibly as every other section of the community. Even now they emigrate in considerable numbers. We have no means of stating *precisely* how many of these classes are now leaving the mother country, but the number of cabin passengers returned by the Emigration Commissioners give us at least a good approximation. These were, in 1851, 16,616, or just *one-twentieth* of the whole emigration,—of whom 9979 went to the United States, 1111 to the North American colonies, and 2401 to Australia, or *one-ninth* of the total number who went there. Surely these numbers are encouraging enough.

Further, all this emigration causes a certain, inevitable increase of our commerce, by which the upper classes in this country, if they are not too foolish and languid, cannot fail to profit.* Every emigrant becomes not only a customer for what England can produce, but a producer of what England wants and can purchase. Every man who goes to Canada grows corn and wants calico. Every man who goes to Australia sends us wool and takes from us broad cloth. He becomes a purchaser to the extent of £6 or £7, and a producer to probably ten times that amount.

But our higher classes must prepare themselves for this change in the future career which lies open to them: the education which fitted them for the liberal professions will not fit them for the active ones—the education which sufficed while elegant indolence was their destined lot, will be fatally inadequate when they are to strive and struggle in conflict with nature and in competition with their fellows. They must brace up their energies, and prepare and resolve to do their work in life; and then, to them as to all other ranks, the MODERN EXODUS may be an incalculable blessing and a noble opportunity.

* A previous Table (p. 158,) shews that our present emigration cannot fail to increase the demand for our productions less than half a million yearly. Thus.

275,000 Emigrants to United States,			
	at 13s. a-head,		£178,750
40,000	"	North American Colonies,	
	at 28s.	"	56,000
50,000	"	Australia,	
	at £6	"	300,000
			£334,750

* The demand for vessels for the purposes of emigration is now so great that the passage money to Australia has risen from £12 to £21 per head.

The first of these is the fact that the
 government has been unable to
 secure the necessary funds to
 carry out its policy. This is due
 to the fact that the government
 has been unable to secure the
 necessary funds to carry out its
 policy. This is due to the fact
 that the government has been
 unable to secure the necessary
 funds to carry out its policy.

1. The first part of the document is a list of names and titles, including "The Hon. Mr. Justice" and "The Hon. Mr. Justice".

THE NORTH BRITISH REVIEW.

No. XXXVI.

FOR FEBRUARY, 1853.

- ART. I.—1. *Tableau général de la Commerce de la France.* 1841-1851.
 2. *Annuaire du Bureau des Longitudes.* 1852.
 3. *La Révolution Sociale démontrée par le Coup d'état.* Par PROUDHON. Almanac de l'Algérie. 1853.
 4. *De L'Expatriation.* Par DUTOT.
 5. *Thoughts on the National Defences.* By ADMIRAL BOWLES. 1852.
 6. *Defenceless State of Great Britain.* By SIR F. B. HEAD. 1851.
 7. *The Perils of Portsmouth: or French Fleets and English Forts.* By JAMES FERGUSSON. London, 1853.

WHEN, exactly twelve months ago, we called the attention of our readers to the state of France, it was at a moment when a Republican form of Government and representative institutions had just been overthrown by one of the most audacious and unscrupulous usurpations of which history makes mention. By naming Louis Napoleon President for ten years, with unlimited power to frame a constitution—by raising him on the bucklers of seven millions of voters—the nation sanctioned the usurpation, and adopted the usurper. By passing such a prompt and ample bill of indemnity, according to one point of view, France made herself a *particeps criminis*, an accessory after the fact; according to another, she declared that Louis Napoleon, by his high-handed *attentat*, had only forestalled her designs, and interpreted her will aright. No one, however, believed that the last act of the drama was played out: in spite of all protestations of moderation, of all disclaimers of ulterior ambition, it was obvious that the Empire was “looming in the distance;”

and the long foreseen 2d of December, 1852, when it arrived, was felt to be only the fitting sequence and the natural completion of the 2d of December 1851. For four years France has been firm and unchanging in her decision, and to all appearance not only faithful but increasingly attached to the man of her choice: six millions elected him President; seven millions made him Dictator; nearly eight millions have named him Emperor. The dynasty of Napoleon again sits upon the throne of France. Like all its predecessors, the Imperial *régime* has had its restoration. The old race of Bourbons was restored after an exile of twenty-one years; the Republic after the lapse of forty-eight; the Empire after an abeyance of thirty-seven. Who believes that the phantasmagoria of changes is run out?

Meantime there is no doubt that the present Government is decidedly and generally popular in France. If we would rightly estimate either the position of our neighbours or our own, we must indulge and persist in no illusion on this head. The election of the Emperor we believe to have been in the main a fair one. There may have been undue influence; there may have been gross ignorance; there may have been scandalous misrepresentation; there may have been bribery; there may have been intimidation:—undoubtedly there were all these; there are all these in every country where popular elections are known. Some may have voted in terror; some may have been urged by self-interest; the priests may have persuaded some; the prefects may have bullied more;—but all these considerations combined, still leave it impossible to believe that the result of the voting just terminated does not in the main truly and faithfully

represent the real wishes and opinions of nine-tenths of the French nation. We may be amazed that it should be so; we may despise the French because it is so; we may grieve that a people who have once tasted the pleasures and the dignity of self-government should be willing to abdicate their functions into the hands of a supreme and irresponsible Ruler; we may moralize as we please over the blind insanity of a nation whose notions of the national *summum bonum* are so strangely at variance with our own—but we must *accept the fact*—as one to be deplored, if we like, and to be explained, if we can—but still to be received and laid to heart as the basis of our reasonings, if we would not run into perilous and fatal blunders. For, be it observed, Louis Napoleon's position is a very different one, both as regards his stability, and *his power of acting upon other nations*, if he be the welcome, chosen, and accepted Emperor of the French, from what it would be were he a mere bold adventurer, who had usurped by stratagem and force a throne from which an oppressed and outraged people were watching for a favourable opportunity to hurl him. In the one case his whole strength must be reserved for and concentrated upon the preservation of his ravished sceptre from his numerous internal conspirators and foes;—in the other, it will be all available for whatever ulterior designs he may entertain against foreign enemies and rivals.

But though his rule is popular, there is no *enthusiasm* either for the Government or for the man. Neither his manners nor his character are fitted to excite enthusiasm. The official attempts to create it, and to represent it as existing, have been both injurious and unsuccessful. In all his grand displays, his splendid shows, his gorgeous progresses and parades, intended to dazzle and please the populace, he appears to us to have made a great mistake, and to have incurred merited failure. He has carried these *spectacles* so far as to annoy and disgust the more rational and thoughtful of his supporters: he has carried them too far even for the childish and meretricious taste of that splendour-loving people; he has overshot his mark, and created even among his popular allies an uneasy feeling that he is treating them rather too much like barbarians or babies. He is popular, not because he has dazzled the excitable imaginations of the people over whom he rules, not because he commands or can arouse any of that loyalty or devotion which the Highlanders felt for Charles Edward, or the old veterans for Napoleon the Great—it is a blunder on his part to pretend that he has it, or to fancy

that he can excite it;—but because there is a general, cool, deliberate, *motivé* conviction that the man and the *régime* are those best suited to the actual position, and possibly to the habitual character of France:* that no hand less resolute, no form of government less dictatorial, would be competent to deal with so shattered, wearied, and demoralized a country: and that only out of the strengthening, recreating, reorganizing rest which a despotic rule can ensure and enforce, can be hoped to dawn a healthier and better state of things.

It is a mistake to imagine that the Empire is popular only with the ignorant peasantry and the ambitious army. From different motives and in different degrees it is popular with nearly all classes,—except the *Rouges*, who for the most part are enemies of all government, and comprise the wild turbulent fanatics, the sanguinary ruffians, and the hopeless, incorrigible rascals who abound in most communities, and whose party, though still numerous and restless, has been too effectually *beheaded* to be as formidable as it once was,—and the *Doctrinaires* and their followers, who naturally, and perhaps justly, are furious at having been jockeyed, defeated, gagged, and reduced to insignificance. It is the hostility of this section which weighs most strongly against Louis Napoleon and the imperial *régime* in the opinion of Englishmen; and it is quite natural that it should do so. This section includes nearly all of those politicians whose names are known in England; it includes the dynastic opposition, as well as the principal ministers of Louis Philippe; it includes most of the literati whose reputation has crossed the Channel; and its members were nearly all admirers of the Parliamentary constitution of England, and the persevering advocates of the introduction of a similar system in France. All these things naturally give the opinions of this party overwhelming influence in this country; and it is difficult to believe that a Government which ignores, banishes, or repels at once Guizot, Thiers, De Tocqueville, De Beau-

* "La masse, il faut l'avouer, parceque cela nous est encore plus honorable que de le taire, la masse, en haut et en bas, a été complice, ici par son inaction, là par ses applaudissements, ailleurs par une co-opération effective, du coup d'état du 2 Décembre. Je l'ai vu, et mille autres, aussi peu suspect de Bonapartisme, l'ont vu aussi: ce n'est pas la force armée, c'est le peuple, indifférent, ou plutôt sympathique, qui a décidé le mouvement en faveur de Bonaparte. "La bataille était gagnée avant d'être livrée. Depuis trois ans la révolution méconnue, outragée, mise en péril appelait un chef,—je veux dire par-là, non plus un écrivain, un tribun, mais un homme en position de la défendre."—Proudhon, *La Rév. Soc.*, p. 70.

mont, Broglie, Molé, and Dufaure, can really be welcome to, or fairly represent the French nation. We have long been accustomed to regard those men as the most able and enlightened politicians in France, and to consider them as the defenders and promoters of a constitutional freedom somewhat like our own; it is their writings we have been accustomed to admire; it is from them that we have been accustomed to take our notions of French interests and French opinions. They formed a galaxy of political and literary talent which shone in the eyes of foreign nations with a lustre which obscured and put out all lesser but more national lights. For the truth we believe to be, that these eminent men, with all their brilliancy, never had any strong hold on the nation; they were beyond it, above it, apart from it, rather than its leaders and representatives; their ideas and objects of admiration were English rather than French; their talents, as writers and speakers, gave them vast influence as long as Parliamentary government prevailed; but they have never inculcated the people with their views; their party was select, but their followers were few. Partly from their merits, but still more from their faults; partly from the *Parliamentariness* and therefore the *unfrenchness* of their notions; partly from the intriguing character of several among them; partly from the notorious and awful corruption of the government which they administered in turn; and partly from the deplorable, disrespected, and clumsy catastrophe in which they finished their career, they are now with five-sixths of Frenchmen the most utterly damaged, discredited, and unpopular party in the country; and were they to join the Emperor and become his ministers, such a step, which we in England should regard as his sanction and his safeguard would, in France, probably be fatal to his power. This position and situation of the *Doctrinaire* party, in their own country, must be fully understood before we can judge of the actual posture of French affairs.

The present Government, as is universally allowed, is popular with the peasantry, especially with that preponderating part of them who are proprietors; and for these reasons: *First* and foremost, on account of the name which stands at its head. The first Napoleon, as we have more than once had occasion to observe, wrote his name indelibly upon the soil of France, and no subsequent ruler has left any impression there at all. His memory is still venerated, not only as the great representative of military glory, but as the strong and skilful reorganizer of the nation after the calamities and confusions of the

Revolution. Mere relationship to him is a tower of strength. *Secondly*, The French peasantry, as proprietors and peaceful cultivators of the soil, feel the want of steadiness and order as distinctly as any part of the community: they had been kept in a perpetual state of disturbance and uneasiness by the changes and rumours of change which succeeded one another for so many years with such bewildering rapidity, and the political motives and causes of which excited in them no interest, and were altogether beyond their comprehension; and they believe that Louis Napoleon has the strong arm and the iron will needed to secure for them the rest they sigh for. Moreover—and this is a point which has been almost entirely overlooked—they do not, it is true, love despotism, or deliberately wish to place over them a wholly irresponsible or autocratic master, but *they comprehend the rule of one man*; they do not, and never did, comprehend the government of a *mob of masters*—a numerous, divided, and wrangling Assembly. We may deplore this incapacity on their part; we may despise their ignorance and their proclivity to servitude; but we must accept the fact, and reckon on it. During the only period when they were without a sovereign, they were governed and harassed by the Clubs, the Communes, the Revolutionary Committee, the Paris Commissaries, the imbecile Directory: and we can scarcely wonder that they shrink from anything which reminds them in the least of those gloomy, anarchical, and sanguinary times. *Thirdly*, The influence of the priests, a great part of them at least, has been diligently exerted on behalf of the present régime, and this influence is very great in many districts, and has of late years been steadily, and to some degree deservedly, increasing. Their control and direction would often, according to our views, be exerted for mischief; they are in many places as ignorant and prejudiced as their flocks—blind leaders of the blind: but still it is said, that ever since the revolution of 1830 they have unremittingly performed their duty among the poor, administered to them the consolations of their religion, visited them in sickness, advised and assisted them in trouble, supported them in the hour of death, and kept up in their hearts the much needed sentiments of obedience and devotion. They are now reaping their reward; and their influence—much as we may regret that such power should be wielded by such unenlightened hands—has been laboriously earned. Whether Louis Napoleon will ultimately turn out to be either the sturdy friend or the obedient son of the Church which the priesthood hope that he is and will remain, may

well be doubted; but at present, throughout the rural districts of France, they are his zealous and efficient allies.

The present Government is popular among a great proportion of the *ouvriers* of most of the towns, of Paris in particular. Many of these, no doubt—the idle and dissipated of them to a man—belonged to the *Rouges* whom Louis Napoleon scourged and decimated with such stern severity; and these, we must suppose, nurse against him a bitter spirit of animosity and revenge. But the Assembly were as hostile to the *Rouge* as Louis Napoleon himself, and he suppressed and outwitted the Assembly. Cavaignac slaughtered and deported them even more mercilessly than Louis Napoleon, and Louis Napoleon defeated and imprisoned Cavaignac. Then Louis Napoleon hates the *bourgeoisie*, whom the *Rouges* also hate. So that if the President and the anarchists do not love each other, they have at least the bond of union of having most of their enemies in common. But the industrious and well-disposed workmen have many solid reasons for adhering to the new Government. They look to employment from the public works which the President is carrying forward on a great scale. At present, not only the regular workmen of Paris, but numbers who have been summoned from the country, are in receipt of ample, even large earnings. Then the Empire is, or is believed and suspected to be, order and stability; and order and stability are to the workmen the synonyms of plenty and comfort. In times of quiet and repose men make money and spend it; in times of anarchy and disturbance men save money and retrench. Hence the tailor, the grocer, the shoemaker, the armourer, the coachmaker, the saddler, the watchmaker, the jeweller, are all Napoleonists, where no personal feeling, arising out of the death or deportation of a *Rouge* relative, interferes to overbear the dictates of material interest. The paralyzing effect of 1848 upon Parisian and Lyonnese industry is not, and will not be for long, forgotten.

Again: strange as it may seem, a considerable portion of the Socialists are, for the moment, adherents of the new Emperor. It is true, that it is from them he is said to have "saved society:" it is true, that where he imprisoned one *bourgeois* he imprisoned a hundred Socialists: it is true, that Socialism is still the bugbear which his advocates hold up before the upper and middle classes as the mysterious horror against which he is their only bulwark. But the Socialists must not be altogether confounded with the Red Republicans. No doubt in many places, and to a great extent, they are identical; but the objects and

aspirations of numbers who bear that proscribed name are social rather than political; and it is believed, and we think with reason, that Louis Napoleon is strongly imbued with some of the Socialist notions; it is known, that he has occupied himself much with the subject of pauperism; and it is supposed, that he is busy with some scheme for its extinction, which will be promulgated as soon as it is ripe and he is firmly established on the imperial throne. He has all along shewn a disposition to base his throne rather on the support of the masses of the people, than on the middle or upper classes; and many of the former are in the habit of saying, "Ah! Louis Blanc and Louis Napoleon are both Socialists, but the former was an extravagant theorist—the latter is a practical man."*

The commercial and manufacturing classes—as men who can only thrive in peace and permanence—are generally friends to the duration of the present Government, and will remain so as long as the Emperor keeps clear of war, which would be fatal to his popularity among them. These classes and those whom they employ have been enormously prosperous ever since the *coup d'état*; and the proclamation of the Empire seems like a seal set upon that stability which has already done so much for them. They are everywhere extending their transactions, embarking in longer and more distant adventures, and even fixing capital which, since 1848, they had kept in realisable securities or in actual cash. They know that a change would be fatal to all their plans, and they will discourage everything which tends even to excite the fear of one.

There can scarcely be a fairer or more speaking indication of the condition and state of feeling among the industrious ranks than is afforded by the Savings Banks accounts. Now we find that in the *Caisse des Rétraites*, as it is called, in the quarter ending last October, the deposits amounted to 22,000,000 francs, and the sums withdrawn to only 3,000,000 francs, shewing an actual accumulation of capital, on the part of the industrious classes, to the extent of 19,000,000 francs. But what more especially merits remark, is the extraordinary progress of the *Caisse des Rétraites* for old age. It was only founded in May 1851, and, on December

* "Ce n'est pas tout. Le Président s'était fait connaître jadis par des écrits socialistes: ses amis conservateurs en avaient presque demandé pour lui pardon au pays. Le peuple, qui juge des hommes d'après lui-même, sait qu'ils peuvent trahir et se vendre, mais qu'ils ne changent pas. Il dit cet le mot est historique: *Barbès a demandé pour nous un milliard aux riches; Bonaparte nous le donnera.*"—Proudhon, p. 75.

31, had only accumulated 1,212,000 francs. On the 30th of September last it possessed a capital of 22,565,000 francs. Out of 15,431 depositors, 6602 are work-people, properly so called, of whom 2966 are women, 771 artisans or petty dealers, 611 servants, 2105 *employés* in humble situations, 363 soldiers and sailors, 718 persons exercising liberal professions, principally priests, and 4361 without professions, half of them minors.

Further: the new *régime* is popular with a very large portion of the Legitimists, and this portion comprising the most energetic, wise, and far-sighted of that party. They believe that Louis Napoleon is not ill-disposed to the Comte de Chambord, and that, if he has no children, he will not be adverse to look upon the Comte as his successor. The gentle and almost respectful tone in which the recent manifesto of the Comte was spoken of in the *Moniteur* goes far to confirm this impression. At all events, the Legitimists feel that every year that Louis Napoleon can hold sway in France will make their future advent and power more probable and more easy, if he should not succeed in founding an hereditary dynasty, and living till its consolidation. They feel that he will settle the disturbed and suppress the turbulent elements of French society,—that he will accustom the French once more to a firm and autocratic rule,—and that not improbably he will re-establish an aristocracy which may ultimately blend with and reinforce their own. They believe also, that, while doing all this, he will fall into blunders and create enemies which will make many persons willing to exchange him for Henri V. Finally, they feel and admit that he is a fitter man for the present posture of affairs than the Comte de Chambord would be; that the Prince is doing the work of the Comte better than the Comte could do it for himself;—for the one is soft and yielding, the other stern, inflexible, and, unrelenting. Few among the Legitimists are anxious for an immediate restoration.

Lastly, The new *régime* is popular among all who want repose; among those who are weary of perpetual turmoil, and those who are sick of repeated failures; among those—and there are many of them—who believe that as soon as he feels himself firmly seated on the imperial throne, Louis Napoleon will discard some of his worst associates, and relax much of that despotic gripe which is endurable only in a crisis of peril and transition; among those real and deeply-thoughtful friends of true freedom—and there are such—who know from history and from reflection that civil liberties can be more easily

won by gradual encroachment from a monarch, than ingrafted upon anarchy, or created by a stroke; and who hope that the present darkness may be a starting-point for the dawn of a better day. And, to sum up and conclude the whole, the continuance and stability of the new Emperor are earnestly desired by those politicians who feel with deep anxiety that he has no rival, and that if he were now to be cut off he could have no successor,—*who believe and know that between Louis Napoleon and anarchy lies at present no third alternative.* The honest Republicans are surprisingly few and feeble; the old politicians of the Chambers are loathed and scouted by all but their own small following; the country has not yet received the idea of the possibility of a Bourbon restoration; and the sins and shortcomings of the Orleans princes must have time to be forgotten before their chance can become a hopeful one. We doubt, from the best information we have been able to obtain, whether (putting aside the Reds and the *mauvais sujets*) out of the thirty-six millions of the French nation, a hundred men could be found who did not deliberately believe that the destruction or discomfiture of Louis Napoleon would be the most awful calamity that could happen to the country in the present posture of affairs.

But though the restoration of the Empire is thus generally welcome and popular in France, it is not to be denied that it has inspired profound disgust and melancholy among many of the better and more aspiring spirits of the nation. Few even of these, indeed, would be prepared to overthrow it, or to wish it overthrown; but they are cut to the heart that their country should so cheerfully acquiesce in such an oppressive rule, and by that acquiescence should confess its suitability. It is not that they resent the tyranny as a violent and wrongful imposition: they admit that France has resigned her liberties unreluctantly, if not voluntarily; but they feel grieved, disappointed and discouraged by the unfitness for more advanced institutions implied in this ready submission to a despot. They are for the most part men to whom the free constitution of England has long been an object of unbounded admiration; who dreamed that it might be acclimated in France; who have toiled in faith and hope during the best years of life to make it strike root in their country, and to educate their countrymen to a perception of its value; and who are now forced to confess that their hopes were too sanguine, and their enterprise and exertions premature. They would have gathered France under the wings of freedom, under the ægis of a

Parliament,—but she would not! They feel as men may be expected to feel who have sold everything to purchase a pearl of great price, and cast it down as an offering of love, before trampling feet and unappreciating eyes. They laid, as they conceive, a real treasure on the altar of their worshipped country, and she has spurned the gift, and cursed the givers. They feel hurt, wounded, and disheartened. They look to the past, and they see every party in succession tried, and found wanting; every form of government in turn adopted and in turn cast aside as unsuitable, or falling to pieces from its inherent weakness; they see France slavish under a despotism, restless under a constitution, turbulent and unmanageable under a republic,—seeking, like a sick man, in feverish changes of posture, the ease which his internal malady denies to him in any. They look at the present, and they see a military usurpation sanctioned by popular acclaim; the higher classes ignorant, prejudiced, and apathetic; the *bourgeoisie* corrupt, selfish, unpatriotic, and material; the working-classes victims of delusive theories, and ready to abjure their political existence. As orators and statesmen their mouths are closed and their occupation gone; as writers they are fettered and warned away; as patriots they scarcely know what to wish or recommend. Some have sought refuge in mere literary studies; some have abjured politics and public life for ever; some speak of voluntary exile, that at least their children may be citizens of a free land, and inheritors of a more hopeful future; some sit by in patient vigilance, waiting for whatever faint possibilities of amelioration may come to light in the next turn of Fortune's wheel; some—and these among the most thoughtful—are utterly despondent of the future, and speak of one military revolution after another, like those of the late Roman Empire, as the only prospect before them.

We, who, as our readers well know, never augured well of the Republic, and were never sanguine as to the success of Parliamentary Government, do not now despair as it is natural for those to do who were accustomed to look in that direction only for the realization of their patriotic hopes. Last year, and the year before, we explained at some length those features in the national character and moral condition of the French which made free political institutions so unworkable among that peculiar people; it is worth while now to give a glance at some of those social facts which make liberty so difficult and so unstable, and an autocratic rule so comparatively easy; and to inquire whether the dawn of a better day ought not to be looked

for in a very different direction from that in which alone it has hitherto been deemed sane to seek it, and whether even the restored Empire, with all its bad antecedents and its inauspicious birth, with all the corrupt and all the sanguinary and all the tyrannical preliminaries of its inauguration, may not be designed by Providence as the avenue—sure though long—gloomy, ignominious, and full of tribulation, but still direct and unavoidable—to a quieter heaven and a brighter sky.

I. The power of expansion—a field to expatiate in—is a necessary of life to all energetic races. The multiplication of lucrative occupations, of means of livelihood, of productive channels of industry, is a necessary of life to all increasing populations. If numbers increase, and remunerative branches of industry do not increase in an equal ratio, poverty and distress must ensue; and poverty and distress generate discontent; and discontent thus generated inevitably makes the task of government difficult and thorny. The uneasy class is always a restless, and generally a turbulent and formidable one. If the activity and energy of the middle and educated classes, from want of objects, openings, and outlets, is compressed and denied a vent, it will find an irregular and dangerous expression in explosive action, which only the strongest government can successively deal with. So long as each young man, as he arrives at manhood, finds scope and field for his powers and aspirations in some occupation or enterprise within his means and suited to his class—so long as employment is waiting for the peasant, commercial industry for the merchant and the clerk, the service of the state for the ambitious and the roving, and a political position for the wealthy and the noble, there is comparatively little to disturb or menace the stability of government or the peace and good order of society. But if any of these vents are closed, or if they should not increase as fast as numbers and energy require, the vigour which ought to be spent in pursuit of individual fortune will assuredly be directed to creating difficulties for the community and for its rulers.

Now, we believe it will be found that one of the great permanent social difficulties of France arises from the fact that the openings and outlets for her increasing population, and especially for the middle and upper classes, are still inadequate, notwithstanding their decided augmentation in late years. We do not intend to weary our readers with statistics, though we have volumes of them at hand; but we will ask them to give a

comparative glance at the condition of England and France with regard to the relative number and expansibility of their respective *débouchées*.

The population of the United Kingdom may be taken at about 27,000,000, and its annual augmentation, by the surplus of births over deaths, at 230,000.* The population of France is now rather above 36,000,000; and its annual augmentation (which varies enormously from year to year) has averaged for the last eight years on record, about 135,000, reaching, however, sometimes as high as 200,000 and upwards. That is, we have to provide outlets or occupations for 230,000 persons annually, and our neighbours for 135,000, on pain of discomfort, discontent, and possible disorganization.

Now the openings or *débouchées* for these numbers are, for Great Britain, the military, naval, and civil service of the State, commerce, manufactures, railways, India, and emigration to the colonies,—for France, the service of the State, commerce, manufactures, railways, and Algeria (which corresponds to our India), but no colonies. The army of France is far greater than ours, and her marine is said to employ nearly as many as ours,† but in time of peace the increase

in the numbers employed cannot be much greater with them than with us; and it is with the absorption of the annual increase of the population that we are now concerned. The civil *employés* in France are nearly twenty times as numerous as those of Great Britain,‡ but their army of *employés* can scarcely be augmented; and, as a more liberal commercial policy, and a freer system of intercourse are adopted, it will have a tendency to diminish; whereas the tendency with us is rather towards an increase.¶

The increase of manufactures, and their power of absorbing the annual augmentation of the population, we have no means of ascertaining with statistical accuracy for either country. We know, however, that this increase has been very great in France, and still continues so, though there is no reason to believe that it advances with a pace as rapid as with us.§ The foreign commerce of a nation may, however, be taken as a generally fair, though not always a perfectly accurate measure of its productive activity. Let us cast a glance at the relative progress of French and English commerce, measured by their exports and imports, and the tonnage of vessels employed.

I.—UNITED KINGDOM.

	Imports. Official Value.	Exports of British Produce. Official Value.	Exports of British Produce. Declared Value.	(Foreign and Home.) Tonnage entered in Port.
1830	£46,245,000	£61,140,000	£38,272,000	5,800,000
1835	48,911,000	78,370,000	47,372,000	6,635,000
1840	67,432,000	102,705,000	51,406,000	9,439,000
1845	85,281,000	134,600,000	60,111,000	12,076,000
1851	103,579,000	190,398,000	74,213,000	13,471,000

II.—FRANCE.

	Imports.	Exports of British Produce.	Exports of British Produce.	(Foreign and Home.)
1830	£25,533,000	£22,906,000	(No returns, but the French official and declared values do not diverge as ours do.)	1,638,000
1835	30,429,000	33,376,000		2,046,000
1840	42,091,000	40,436,000		4,870,000
1845	49,605,000	47,497,000		4,662,000
1851	46,320,000	65,160,000¶		4,987,000

* The average surplus in England and Wales, during the five years ending with 1851, was 173,000. Of Scotland we have no account, and in Ireland, we believe that there has been no surplus at all. The last two years, however, the increase in England has been much greater than this average. In 1851 it was 220,000.

† The French army numbers 393,000 men; ours, 130,000. The French marine 27,000; ours, 40,000.

‡ French civil servants, 535,000; ours about 25,000.

¶ The real difference, too, it must be remembered, between the number of civil servants in the two countries is by no means as enormous as it appears—many of those who hold under the crown, in

France, holding under the people or the local authorities in England.

§ It is, however, very important to bear in mind that as the tendency is always towards an *economy of labour* in manufacturing productions, any given amount produced represents yearly fewer hands employed, *i. e.* a smaller amount of absorbed labour and population. Two persons now produce as much as three or four did twenty years ago, in many branches of industry.

¶ It may be doubted whether the sudden and rapid increase of exports since 1848 be altogether a genuine test of increase of production or even of commerce,—*i. e.*, whether it may not be in some measure

III.—STATE AND PROGRESS OF FRENCH AND ENGLISH MERCANTILE MARINE.

FRENCH.				BRITISH.		
	Ships.	Tonnage.	Average size.	Ships.	Tonnage.	Average size.
1830	14,852	708,880	48	23,721	2,531,820	106
1841	13,383	590,262	44	30,052	3,512,480	116
1851	14,557	704,429	48	35,000	4,332,085	124

The introduction of railways has, in recent years, supplied to France a most important opening for the industry both of the labouring and middle classes, and has done much towards finding a harmless and beneficial vent for the restless energy and active ambition that would otherwise have gone to swell the social elements of turbulence. Of the number employed in the construction of railways we have no account; but it must have been great. The number to whom the railways now completed (or about to be so) will furnish permanent occupation we estimate to be about 30,000, of all classes, workmen, engineers, clerks, and superintendents;* and we shall not be far wrong if we anticipate an increase to this number, as railways spread, of about 1000 a-year.

Algeria is to France what India is to us, and more; for though its soil is far less productive, and its commerce incomparably smaller, yet it employs a much greater number of European troops, and attracts a much larger proportion of permanent colonists of the middle and labouring classes. It is, in fact, a colony as well as a military settlement. The number of civil *employés* of the upper classes (exclusive of clerks, policemen, &c.) in Algeria are now about 250; and the military force employed varies from 60,000 to 80,000 men. The native population resident in towns and villages, amounts to about 85,000, of whom 4000 are negroes, and nearly 20,000 Jews; the unsettled

accounted for by a diminution in the home consumption. The imports have for many years not increased at all. Thus they were (in millions of francs) —

In 1842.	1142	In 1847.	1343
1843.	1187	1848.	862
1844.	1193	1849.	1142
1845.	1240	1850.	1174
1846.	1257	1851.	1158

* We have not been able to procure from the French public offices any complete account of the railway *employés*; but the Rouen and Dieppe line of 174 miles, employed 947 persons, exclusive of engine drivers and stokers. By a Parliamentary return up to the 30th of June 1849, 5447 miles of railway then open in England gave regular occupation to 55,968 persons. From these data we calculate that the 3000 miles of French railway will employ about 30,000. The length of lines open at the beginning of 1850 was 1720 miles, with 1270 more in process of completion; a great proportion of which is now finished, or on the eve of being so.

Arabs are about 3,000,000; and the European population in 1852 reached to 133,000, of whom however only 67,500 were French, and 42,500 Spaniards. During the last eight years the Europeans have increased about 74,000, of whom half may be French; but as part of this is natural augmentation, we cannot assume that Algeria affords an outlet of permanent colonization to the mother country for more than about 4000 persons annually. Compare this with the openings for English enterprise and energy which her colonies afford her. The Civil Government of India employs 808 English civilians in the colony, and about 200 at home; and the Government of our other colonies probably gives occupation to about as many more. The relative number of merchants and their dependents engaged in the colonial trade of the two countries we have no means of comparing: the extent of the trade itself we have. The exports from France to Algeria in 1851 reached to £2,650,000, and her imports thence £660,000. Of our imports from our colonies there exists no official record: We know, however, that twenty years ago they had reached the value of £6,338,000 from India alone, and that since that time the amount of most of the chief articles of produce has greatly increased. But our exports to our colonies reached in 1850 £18,000,000. Then, while in the last twenty years France has transferred to Algeria only about 60,000 of her people, and is now sending about 4000 a year, we have sent to our colonies (exclusive of the vast emigration to the United States) in the same period, just a million of our population, and are now supplying them at the rate of more than 80,000 a-year!

Notwithstanding this comparison, however, there can be no doubt that Algeria is to France a possession of great value, and will probably become more and more so every year. The country now under French rule is about two-thirds the size of France, and contains 39,000,000 *hectares*; the soil is said to be fertile and well watered; the climate similar to that of the most favoured parts of the south of Europe; and the productions many, various, and all excellent of

their kind. The wheat, oil, and tobacco are said to be of the finest quality, and iron, zinc, and copper are among the exports. The country is being colonized, though not at our Anglo-Saxon rate: culture is extending, irrigation is much attended to, and many of the public works of the ancient possessors are being cleared out and made available. The French fondly look forward to the time when, by the help of Algeria they will become altogether independent of foreign commerce, or (as they, in their ignorance of economical science, express it) when "they will be able to free themselves from the *tribute* which they now pay to other nations." They expect, too, gradually to extend their African territory by the ultimate absorption of Morocco on the one side, and Tunis on the other; they believe, and with reason, that they will be driven to this extension, as we have been in India, by a sort of inevitable fate—*i. e.*, by that train of natural events which almost invariably succeed one another when a strong and intrusive race are side by side with feeble but aggressive neighbours. If we are wise, we shall offer them no hindrance in this fated career, which will occupy them probably for generations, and may drain off energy, wealth, and numbers that might and would be otherwise mischievously employed in Europe.

To a country like France, and to a people like hers, shattered, fretted, disappointed, full of restless activity, and morbid ambition, a colony in which these disturbing energies can find vent is a necessity. We cannot forbear quoting the following passage from one of the most profound and farsighted statesmen France ever produced,—on account both of its substance and the singular beauty of its language. It is from a Memoir which Talleyrand read before the Academy of Sciences in 1798.

"Et combien de Français doivent embrasser avec joie cette idée! Combien en est il chez qui, ne fut ce que pour des instans, un ciel nouveau est devenu un besoin! Et ceux qui, restés seuls, ont perdu sous le fer des assassins tout ce qui embellissoit pour eux la terre natale; et ceux pour qui elle est devenue inféconde; et ceux qui n'y trouvent que des regrets; et ceux même qui n'y trouvent que des remords; et les hommes qui ne peuvent se résoudre à placer l'espérance là où ils éprouveront le malheur; et cette multitude de malades politiques, ces caractères inflexibles qu'aucun revers ne peut plier, ces imaginations ardentes qu'aucun raisonnement ne ramène, ces esprits fascinés qu'aucun événement ne désenchanté;—et ceux qui se trouvent trop réservés dans leur propre pays; et les spéculateurs avides; et les spéculateurs aventureux;—et les hommes qui brûlent d'attacher leurs noms à des découvertes, à des fondations des villes, à des civilisations; tel pour qui la

France constituée est encore trop agitée; tel même pour qui elle est trop calme;—ceux enfin qui ne peuvent se faire à des égaux, et ceux aussi qui ne peuvent se faire à aucune dépendance."

Other countries which have no colonies of their own relieve themselves of their superabundant numbers by emigration to foreign lands. The Germans, as we shewed in a recent Article, are flocking to America at the rate of 100,000 a year. But this expatriation to alien countries where a different language and different habits prevail is distasteful to a sociable race like the French, and if we except a few who go to South America, Algeria remains their only vent. If, then, we add to the fact of their slowly developing commerce, of their stationary marine, of their only moderate progress in railway communication, and of the scantiness of their colonial resources, the further consideration that, with them, women engage in many of the occupations which are exclusively confined to men with us, (as clerks, accountants, &c.)—and that, while many rush into *speculation*, the slow gains, and the laborious, obscure, and unexciting employments of regular commerce are still despised by the great majority of the educated classes,—we shall see ample reason to conclude that the various outlets and careers which France at present provides are insufficient for the absorption of her rising numbers or the employment of her restless energies. From this insufficiency inevitably arises one of the greatest dangers a government can have to encounter: in this is presented one of the hardest problems a government can be called upon to solve. Now, there is good reason to believe that both the Emperor and many among the party which supports him, are perfectly aware of the serious nature of the difficulty which is here presented to them, and will do their best to meet it; though imperfect education and confused ideas of political economy may often lead them to seek a solution by illegitimate means and in a wrong direction. Still he may do much, and his adherents expect that he will. He may, by preserving external and internal peace, give scope and time for that development of private enterprise which needs only security to achieve almost miracles of wealth;—and the spring which industrial undertakings have exhibited since the *coup*, affords a most encouraging earnest of the progress which, if guarded from interruption, they will make. He may facilitate and encourage the formation of new railways, which, both while constructing and when constructed, not only give employ-

ment to so many of all ranks, but open new channels of adventure, and aid prosperity and progress in a thousand ways;—and we know that he is anxious to do this. He may, both by the multiplication of railways and by the many channels which are open to a centralized and interpenetrating administration like that of France, spread among the provinces the knowledge of new modes of investment and easy access to them, and thus, by shewing to the people other and more lucrative ways of employing their savings, mitigate that inordinate competition for land, and that irrationally high price for it, which now create so much mischief and embarrassment among the peasant proprietary. Ignorant of shares and funds, and suspicious of the risks of trade, the industrious provincial has at present no conceptions of any other way of disposing of his cash except by purchasing some field adjoining to his own, which will probably yield him only two per cent., while perhaps to complete the purchase he borrows from some notary at eight per cent. The new *Banque du crédit foncier*, questionable as are its principle and management, shews that the Government has its eye upon the evil. Lastly, Louis Napoleon may do something to make commercial occupations honourable, by honouring and respecting those engaged in them; and he may do much to mitigate one of the greatest difficulties of French enterprise and industry, by insuring and maintaining that tranquillity and order which alone is able, and is alone sufficient, to induce foreign capital to flow in torrents into the country. Want of capital is felt throughout France, and peace will not only attract it from abroad, but enable it to accumulate at home.

The subject of the condition of the working-classes is known to have occupied the mind of the new Emperor for many years;* he is believed to be engaged in meditating some schemes for raising that condition, almost socialistic in their tendency; and he is certainly more fully alive than most of his predecessors on the throne to the vast importance, as regards the stability and comfort of Government, of securing ample employment and a low price of food for the people. Some recent mysterious and most costly operations in the corn market, which have been, with much appearance of probability, traced to his Government, and which must have been undertaken with a view of keeping down the price of wheat in France, throw considerable light upon the views and

notions of Louis Napoleon on this head. They were most ingeniously exposed in the *Economist* two months ago.*

II. One of the peculiarities in the present state of French society, which is most hostile to the stability of political institutions and the extension of regulated liberty, is the absence of an Aristocracy—of a permanent, powerful, and wealthy class, which could act both as a connection and a barrier between the subject on one side, and the monarch on the other: which could at once maintain the throne against the discontent and turbulent aggressions of the populace, and protect the people against the encroachments of despotic power. The privileged and influential body which we have found throughout our history such an invaluable bulwark both of liberty and authority, exists no longer as a class in France. Many of the old noble families remain, but shorn of their influence, impoverished in their means, and shattered in their organization. Though the distinction of *feeling* between a noble and a *roturier* exists nearly as marked as ever, the *order* is gone. The law of equal inheritance destroyed it, far more effectually than the decrees which abolished a privileged Peerage by direct enactment. We are not going to discuss the relative merits of the law of primogeniture, and the law of equal subdivision of the patrimonial property: such an argument would require an entire treatise to do it justice. We are concerned now with only one or two of the social consequences of the latter system as it prevails in France. Primogeniture creates and maintains a class whose large possessions make them essentially conservative; whose ancestral traditions make them too proud to surrender, without a tenacious and prolonged struggle, any of their privileges to assaults from below, or any of their liberties to encroachments from above; whose mutual jealousies prevent them from combining to oppress the people, whose organization and common interests prevent them from succumbing to the unconstitutional ambition of the throne. The law of equal inheritance, by dissipating the wealth, dividing the estates, and destroying the feudal influence of the noble and the great, at once relieves them from the political obligations of nobility, and renders them powerless to fulfil them. The intermediate constitutional barrier is removed; and the people and its chief stand face to face, each left to his own unaided strength.

Further: The case of equal division cre-

* He is the author of a work on the Extinction of Pauperism.

* See the *Economist* newspaper for 13th November, 1852.

ates great numbers who have just enough to live upon : enough to command many of the enjoyments of life—not enough to impose upon them the duties which large property, especially in land, almost always brings with it. They do not, like our younger sons, who have little or nothing, set to work to become the architects of their own fortune, and the creators of a new name ; they live upon their scanty income, and the energy that ought to have been spent in earning a livelihood, is diverted into the public channels ; the excitement which the pursuit of wealth might have furnished them, they are driven to seek in political intrigue and party strife. They can afford to be idle ; but idleness brings ennui, and ennui seeks refuge in exhausting dissipation, in the strife of journalism, in the passions and intrigues of the Parliamentary arena, or (it may be and has often been) in conspiracies, *émeutes*, and revolutions. Moreover, their moderate share of a divided patrimonial inheritance, laid up in a napkin, instead of being put out to profitable use, constantly drawn upon and never augmented, is, in many cases, soon spent, and often lost ; and when thus reduced to poverty, they become, not diligent, but desperate. An Englishman or an American would endeavour to retrieve his fortune by energy, industry, and enterprise : a Frenchman, unaccustomed to labour, and habituated to despise it, seeks for his rehabilitation in the chapter of political accidents. It is true enough that we in England, especially in those classes most prone to need excitement and to suffer from ennui, have numbers of indolent and unoccupied men ; but the great difference between the cases of the two communities is this : our idle men are generally *rich* ; the idle men of Paris are generally *poor*. The men about town in England are either wealthy, or closely connected with those who are so, and therefore essentially conservative and aristocratic : in France they are, in overwhelming proportion, needy and embarrassed. The men who came to the surface in 1848, and who guided if they did not make the revolution, were, with scarcely an exception, over head and ears in debt.

Besides the danger to Government arising from this source, the standard of public morality suffers in a deplorable degree. The habits of the actual Parisian society involve all public and prominent men in an amount of expenditure which only ample fortunes could supply. But exceedingly few men in France have private property sufficient to sustain the luxury of lofty station, and of these few only a small portion enter into public life. A statesman who is at the same time a poor man, as most of them are, is

therefore involved in expenditure which necessitates some supplemental source of income. Hence, not only the constant habit of French politicians of jobbing in the public and other securities, but the ready absolution given by general opinion to conduct which, in England, would stain a statesman's reputation past redemption. It is felt that in the majority of instances, a man who becomes a minister in France, *must* job, in order to make both ends meet.

Now, we found in France, among reflecting politicians of nearly all parties, not only a general and increasing conviction of the mischief wrought by this law of equal division in preventing the accumulation and circulation of capital, and in prohibiting the formation of a powerful, permanent, and wealthy class,—but a strong impression that the present ruler of the country would and ought to attempt some modification or repeal of the law in question. The Emperor, they say, may do this : no one else could. No popular or representative government would dare even to propose its abrogation or alteration : the passion for equality among the French people makes them cling to this law with a morbid and irrational tenacity. But a despotic government might brave the first opposition which would certainly be aroused by the proposition of a change ; and in a few months the popular indignation would have spent itself, and would die away. The greatest difference of opinion, however, prevails as to the extent to which it is desired that the Emperor should, and expected that he will, modify the existing regulation. One party thinks that, considering how small the families generally are in France, it would be sufficient to allow the father *two* child's portions to dispose of instead of only one as at present,* and that this is the limit of change which it would be safe or possible to attempt. The Legitimists, many of them, hope that Louis Napoleon will go much farther than this, and leave the matter entirely at the option of the parent, in which case they imagine that most of the noblesse, and many of the wealthier *bourgeoisie*, in order to found or to maintain a family, would revert to the custom of primogeniture, and endow an eldest son. Others, again—and these we believe to be the best informed as to his intentions and opinions—suppose that he will compromise the matter by authorising the creation

* The existing law enacts that the property shall be divided into as many portions as there are children, and *one over*. Over this supplementary portion alone has the father testamentary power. If he has five children he may give to any one he chooses, not *one-fifth*, but *two-sixths*. If he has three children, he may give one of them not *one-third*, but *two-fourths*, or *one-half*, and so on.

of *majorats*, for which step he would have the sanction of his uncle's example. The mode of operation, it is imagined, would be this:—He would enact that any man of a certain rank—or perhaps without any limitation as to rank—possessed of a certain amount of wealth, might create a *majorat*; *i.e.*, might set apart a specified portion of his income or his property, landed or funded, as an endowment for his eldest or his chosen son, (the remainder to be divided among the children in equal proportion,) which endowment should descend undivided and entailed in the direct course of primogeniture. Thus, if a marshal of the Empire, or an old marquis, or a millionaire banker, had a property, say of two million of francs, he should be authorized to set apart one million as an endowment for the *majorat*, which should descend unbroken from eldest son to eldest son, through future generations, while the remaining million should be divided among all the children according to the provisions of the actual law. By this means a race of men would be created of ample and of certain incomes, who by that circumstance alone would not only become a stable class, but, as with us, would naturally form the class out of whom statesmen would be chosen, inasmuch as their wealth would give them means of studying the art of government and preparing themselves for taking part in it,—would exempt them from the low temptations to which needy politicians are exposed, and would render them too influential to be lightly neglected or alienated by any ruler. They might not be a titled or a privileged class, but they would enjoy most of the power and discharge many of the functions of an aristocracy; and they might form a body with which the old noblesse—now so ignorant, proud, prejudiced, and indolent—might amalgamate with advantage, and in which it might in time be merged.

One great reason for believing that Louis Napoleon will do something of this sort is, that his uncle, of whom he is the fanatical imitator, did so before him. The account of Napoleon's establishment of *majorats* is given by Thiers in his "Consulat et l'Empire," l. xxviii.

"Il voulait, avec ce qu'il donnerait à ses généraux, fonder de grandes familles, qui entourassent le trône, concourussent à le défendre, contribuassent à l'éclat de la société Française, sans nuire à la liberté publique, sans entraîner surtout aucune violation des principes d'égalité proclamés par la révolution Française. L'expérience a prouvé qu'une aristocratie ne nuit point à la liberté d'un pays, car l'aristocratie Anglaise n'a pas moins contribué que les autres classes de la nation à la liberté de la Grande Bretagne. La raison dit encore qu'une aristo-

cratie peut être compatible avec le principe de l'égalité, à deux conditions: premièrement, que les membres qui la composent ne jouissent d'aucuns droits particuliers, et subissent en tout la loi commune; secondement, que les distinctions purement honorifiques, accordées à une classe, soient accessibles à tous les citoyens d'un même état, qui les ont achetées par leurs services ou leurs talents. . . . Napoléon profita donc de la gloire de Tilsit, et du prestige dont il était entouré en ce moment, pour accomplir enfin le projet qu'il méditait depuis longtemps, d'instituer une noblesse. . . . Il établit par un sénatus-consulte que les dignitaires de l'Empire, à tous les degrés, pourraient transmettre à leur fils aîné un titre, qui serait celui de duc, de comte, ou de baron, suivant la dignité du père à la condition d'avoir fait preuve d'un certain revenu, dont le tiers au moins devait demeurer attaché au titre conféré à la descendance. . . . Tel fut l'origine des *majorats*. Les grands dignitaires durent porter le titre d'*altesse*. Leurs fils aînés durent porter le titre de *ducs*, si leur père avait institué en leur faveur un *majorat* de 200,000 livres de rente. Les ministres, les sénateurs, les conseillers d'Etat, les Présidents du corps législatif, les archevêques, furent autorisés à porter le titre de *comtes*, et à transmettre le titre à leurs fils ou neveux, sous la condition d'un *majorat* de 30,000 livres de rente. Enfin les présidents des collèges électoraux à vie, les procureurs généraux et évêques, et plusieurs autres, furent autorisés à porter le titre de *barons*, et à le transmettre à leurs fils aînés, sous la condition d'un *majorat* de 15,000 livres de rente. Les simples Membres de la Légion d'Honneur purent s'appeler *Chevaliers*, et transmettre ce titre moyennant un *majorat* de 3000 livres de rente."

Such is the example which it seems probable that Louis Napoleon will follow, if his power lasts till matters are ripe for the attempt.

III. Some of the most formidable difficulties which the present or indeed any Government has to contend with in France, arise from the mode in which the army is recruited. The soldiers there do not, as with us, choose the military profession as a career, enlist voluntarily and enlist for life; but every year a list is made up of the young men in each department who attain their twentieth year, and out of this number (about 250,000) 80,000 conscripts are selected by ballot. These serve in the ranks for seven years, and then return into the mass of citizens. The evil consequences of this system are manifold. In the *first* place, as all conscripts are rejected who are under size, who are feeble in health, or who suffer under any bodily defect or incapacity, the troops consist of the *élite* of the nation's youth, physically speaking, and those who are left at home to cultivate the soil, perform the peaceful functions of citizens, and

perpetuate the race, are the inferior and rejected portion. To this circumstance, it is said, much of the physical deterioration of the people is to be ascribed, and we can believe, with much truth. *Secondly*, when these conscripts, after having passed the seven most active and impressible years of their life in the idle, dissipated, roving career of the garrison and the camp, are disbanded and mingle with their fellow-countrymen, they are without any trade or occupation, little disposed perhaps to learn one, and at all events untaught and without the manual and professional skill which early practice can alone give. They commence industrial avocations often with distaste, always at a disadvantage; and the sentiment of superiority which they must in many respects feel as compared with those around them, increases and fosters their discontent. *Thirdly*, By this arrangement, not only is a vast proportion of the French people trained to the use of arms and the manœuvres both of regular and desultory warfare, but the army consists of young soldiers and the people of veterans; the enrolled troops are (comparatively) the raw levies; the disbanded troops are the experienced soldiers. The result is, that in any insurrection, *émeute*, or street fighting, the insurgents not only can readily find admirably trained men to organise and lead them, but in the main may and often do consist of these very men. The best troops are on the side of the revolutionary mobs. In England, a handful of soldiers are a match for thousands of undisciplined civilians. In France, rebels and regiments meet on nearly equal terms. It is said—we cannot say with what truth—that Louis Napoleon is fully alive to the dangers and mischiefs arising from this source, and that he intends to reorganize at least a portion of the army on the footing of voluntary enlistment for life, or for twenty years. If he does this he may largely reduce the army without rendering it one whit less efficient.

IV. Those who have watched the interior workings of society in France long and close at hand, are inclined to attribute much of that uselessness and discontent which is one of its most striking features, and which is the despair both of the friends of order and the friends of freedom, to the national system of education. This is considered to embody two characteristic errors, both of which are dangerous, and both of which operate in the same direction,—it is too literary and too little industrial and utilitarian, and it is too uniform for all classes. The great proportion of those who attend it acquire, it is said, a smattering of literature,

just sufficient to give them a distaste for the humble and useful occupations of their parents, a desire for intellectual excitement of a miscellaneous and often of a low description, and a conceit of their own fitness for careers and professions which demand a really liberal and comprehensive education. Then members of various grades and classes in the social scale are instructed together, in the same schools, in the same mode, and on the same subjects, to a degree of which we have no example here. If the peasant, the grocer, or the tailor can scrape together a little money, his son receives his training in the same seminary as the son of the proprietor whose land he cultivates, whose sugar and coffee he supplies, and whose coat he makes. The boy who ought to be a labourer or a petty tradesman, sits on the same bench and learns the same lesson as the boy who is destined for the bar, the tribune, or the civil service of the State. This system arises out of the passion for equality, and fosters it in turn. The result is, that each one naturally learns to despise his own destination, and to aspire to that of his more fortunate school-fellow. The grocer's son cannot see why he should not become an advocate, a journalist, or a statesman, as well as the wealthier and noble-born lad who was often below him in the class, whom he occasionally thrashed, and often helped over the thorny places of his daily task. Hence numbers who might have remained useful, respectable, and contented citizens in their own humble line, are tempted to "rush out of their sphere," and emulate those whose wealth and social position give them most advantages in the race. Defeated competition with those of higher rank becomes in their ill-regulated minds conspiracy against the rank itself, and the state of society to which they attribute their defeat. Instead of following their parents' career, they aspire to that of their companions, and their parents' ambition often stimulates them to the unequal strife. They go to Paris or some large provincial town, become students of Medicine, or of Law, or, if still more ambitious, and gifted with any superficial cleverness, attempt the ruinous and disappointing channel of the Press. They fail from incapacity, indolence, imperfect education, dissipated habits, or want of means to continue the struggle; they become *hommes manqués*, and degenerate into *émeutiers*, *chevaliers d'industrie*, (*Anglicé*, sharpers,) or malignant penny-aliners.*

* Some steps have been already taken to mitigate the evil, by rendering the instruction given in the national seminaries, especially the primary and continental ones, less literal and more practical.

The following picture from a French writer of great talent is well worth perusal:—"La démocratie sociale se recrute principalement à Paris dans deux professions : les avocats et les gens de lettres. Le corps des avocats et la cohue des gens de lettres forment deux sociétés souterraines qui sont très peu connues du peuple, Français lui-même. Ce sont les deux professions qui sont les plus faciles quant au titre à obtenir, et les plus difficiles en même temps, si l'on songe aux obstacles sans nombre qu'il faut traverser pour arriver par elles à une position sociale fixe et stable; et comme ces deux professions sont les plus larges de toutes, comme ces titres d'avocats et d'hommes de lettres sont les plus indéterminés de tous, ce sont aussi les professions et les titres qui cachent le plus de misères. On n'imagine pas le nombre de ceux qui à Paris se décorent de ces titres et qui usent le pavé en attendant une révolution : il y a des avocats qui ne donnent que des leçons d'Allemand, et des hommes de lettres qui n'usent d'autre papier que le livre de comptes de leur estaminet habituel. Je me rappelle que, dans les premiers temps de mon séjour à Paris, je me rendis un jour Rue St. Jacques, chez un avocat qui prétendait donner des leçons d'Allemand, langue que je désirais alors beaucoup apprendre. Je demeurai consterné en apercevant tant de misère unie à une vanité aussi naïve et aussi déplacée. Au dernier étage d'une maison étroite et dont les escaliers rappelaient ces cauchemars où l'on se sent pressé entre deux murs qui se rapprochent toujours, comme pour vous étouffer, habitait l'avocat maître de langues. Pour arriver jusqu'à lui, il fallait traverser tout un détrit des chaises cassées, de meubles vermoulus, de paniers défoncés, de bouteilles sans goulot, et d'autres instrumens pareils; car le malheureux habitait au-dessus de cet étage qui à Paris sert aux portiers à déposer tous les utensiles de rebut, et remplace les greniers. Pompeusement il avait écrit au-dessus de sa porte : *M. D. Avocat*. Cette chambre n'indiquait pas la misère, car elle était la misère elle-même; les murs nus n'y étaient pas même en haillons; le plafond était depuis longtemps absent. Une robe de chambre innommable recouvrait les membres du malheureux accordé sur un table à laquelle manquait un pied, et dont un second était prolongé au moyen de deux briques cassées. La conversation s'engagea et comme je jetais les yeux sur les sales papiers qui encombraient cette table : 'Voici, me dit-il d'un air magistral, le dernier discours d'ouverture que M. la Président Dupin m'a envoyé.' Je demeurai

confondu de tant de vanité unie à tant de pauvreté. . . . Quant aux hommes de lettres pris en masse, ma surprise a été plus pénible encore. . . .

"Nous répétons que, par la dislocation que les uns opèrent dans les intelligences et par les manœuvres tortueuses des autres, par la vie souterraine qui leur est commune, ces deux professions d'avocat et d'homme de lettres exercent dans la société Française une influence fatale, et qu'elles sont les deux dissolvans les plus actifs de leur pays. Natures pleines de vanité, sans ressources morales pour purifier l'irritation qu'une gêne incessante jeta dans leur vie, il se retournent et mordent,—ou, bien ceux qui ont le plus de force morale s'occupent à miner les principes du pouvoir incessamment, sans relâche, froidement, et sans que les douleurs qui les harcellent les arrêtent un moment."*

The last remarks throw some light upon a subject which has always been one of great perplexity and surprise to Englishmen—the state of the press in France, the mode in which it is treated, and the light in which it is regarded. We have never been able fully to comprehend, in a nation so enlightened and unrestrained as the French, either the ceaseless war which every Government, whatever was its origin and constituent elements, has always waged against journalism, nor the quietness and apparent satisfaction with which its despotic and merciless repression by Louis Napoleon has been received and acquiesced in. Napoleon the Great always declared, that if the press were left free, as in England, it would not only destroy every administration and every party, but would render all government impossible in France; and every successive ruler or ministry which has held the reins of power has, either avowedly or implicitly, confirmed his statement. Legitimate monarchs, despotic monarchs, monarchs by popular choice, administrations composed of journalists and men of letters, assemblies chosen by universal suffrage,—have all vied with one another in the severity of their laws for gagging and muzzling the press, and in the rigour with which they have prosecuted editors and newspaper-writers. And what is strangest of all is, that, of late years, at least, the people seem to have approved and sanctioned this repressive action of the authorities. Charles X. endeavoured to put down the freedom of the press by illegal ordinances, but the attempt cost him his throne. Louis Philippe suc-

* *Revue des deux Mondes*. Mœurs Démocratiques et Sociales. Par Emile Montégut.

ceeded him, and called to his Cabinet the very men whose fame and fortune had been made by journalism; but no sooner was he firmly established on the throne, than he found or deemed it necessary to turn round upon the power which had mainly contributed to his elevation, and both Thiers and Guizot supported him in restrictive laws and constant prosecutions. Juries were generally ready to convict, and judges always ready to inflict the severest penalties. When Louis Philippe was replaced by a Republic an assembly elected by universal suffrage, not only required a very heavy *cautionnement* to be deposited as security for good behaviour before any one was allowed to establish a journal, but struck the most fatal blow ever aimed at the influence of the press, by the law which enacted that every writer must affix his name to his articles,—thus depriving him both of the shelter and the weight of the anonymous. Moreover, during this time of popular government, there was, we believe, only one instance in which a jury refused to convict in the case of a newspaper prosecution. Lastly, the very first act of the President after the *coup d'état* was to destroy all remains of freedom and independence in the daily press; and no one of his acts assuredly met with such general, cordial, or prompt approval. Some were indignant at being denied a channel for the expression of their indignation: some deplored the impossibility which resulted of obtaining accurate information as to public occurrences; some thought the repression needlessly stringent; but of the wisdom, the justice, the necessity, and the beneficent operation of some such measure, at all events as a temporary one, we scarcely heard two opinions among the leaders and respectable men of all parties in France.

The truth is, that by little and little the newspaper press, with a few exceptions, had fallen from the high position and character it once enjoyed to a state of the most unbounded and merited contempt and aversion. It had ceased to be a public protector, and had become a public enemy and a public danger. It respected nothing, and was respected by no one. After the Restoration and up to 1830, it was chiefly in the hands of able, instructed, honourable men—often ambitious, sometimes unscrupulous, but still men of earnest convictions, resolute purpose, and high attainments. About 1829, it had reached its highest glory and its widest influence. Chateaubriand and Benjamin Constant were gone from the stage; but Thiers, Mignet, Guizot, Villemain, Cousin, Salvandy, Armand Carrel, and many others, were in

the noon-day of activity and strength, and laboured to inoculate the country with their principles in the columns of the *Globe*, the *Constitutionnel*, and the *National*. As the reading public multiplied, and the fame and power of journalism increased, new papers were set on foot, but these were unavoidably conducted by men of less ability and knowledge, supplying an inferior article, and satisfied with a lower remuneration. The Revolution of 1830 carried many of the writers of the highest genius and reputation into the Ministry; from journalists they became active and practical statesmen, and of course had to abandon their previous vocation. The consequences were twofold:—*First*, Their places had to be supplied by men of far lower attainments and capacities and less fixed and sincere opinions, who endeavoured to make up in piquancy what their articles wanted in solidity and value, and, like bad cooks, attempted to disguise by unlimited salt and pepper the poverty of their materials and the imperfection of their workmanship. *Secondly*, The success of the first class of writers, whose pens had gained them Ministerial portfolios, inflamed to the utmost degree the ambition of every smart Parisian or aspiring provincial who imagined himself endowed with any literary talent; the friends and relations of those who had been thus successful implored them to introduce them into the career of journalism; new journals were established which had to force a circulation as they best might, by universal *dénigrement*, by spicing highly, and attacking indiscriminately; the class of contributors became worse and worse, and newspaper writing from being an honourable profession, sank to the ignominy of a trade. Then one of the chief of these competitors for public favour (Emile de Girardin, we believe) set the example of lowering the price of his paper, in the hope of securing a wider circulation than his rivals. This obliged him, first, to lower the rate of remuneration to his contributors, and of course to be contented with an inferior set; and, secondly, to write down to a lower audience, and pepper more coarsely still. Political articles were not always stimulating enough for appetites that had long fed on garbage and on poison, so the *feuilletons* of Eugène Sue's stamp were introduced, and completed the degradation and denaturalisation of the public taste. Things went on thus till a considerable portion of the press got into the hands of mere literary braves, assassins, panders, and adventurers, without principles, without convictions, of perverted and mutilated powers, of imperfect and superficial knowledge, mere manufacturers for money, who would often

write at the same moment for two hostile journals, and on opposite sides of the same question, and who respected neither the decencies of private life nor the duties of a public station. Of course there were journals to whom these observations would not apply; but with these exceptions, if we take our "Satirist," "Northern Star," "The Nation," and other of the more violent Irish papers, we shall have a pretty fair idea of the sort of political excitement which was daily served up to the Parisian public. Journalism had lost its character, but not its power. It became a discredit to men of real ability and reputation to be connected with it. Much of it sank to what it is now—a common sewer—*un véritable égout*, as we heard one leading minister describe it. Still it exercised influence over the hasty and fiery temperaments of Frenchmen which our cooler and more phlegmatic spirits cannot adequately estimate. It still acted as a fire-brand and a poison; it still had power to arouse the passions of that excitable people, just as a dram can madden and intoxicate, though known by the drinker to be noxious and adulterated;—and when Louis Napoleon put it down with so relentless a gripe, the nation thanked him, as we might thank a despot who withheld "fire-water" from the Red Indian savages around us, or who shut up gin-shops in a time of popular fury and commotion.

The death of journalism in France was probably necessary to its resurrection in a purer spirit and a healthier frame. The time will come, sooner or later—the adherents even of the new Emperor avow their expectation of that time—when a period of peace and quiet shall have calmed the furious passions which revolution after revolution has engendered and nursed; when France, restored by fasting to a sound and healthy appetite, shall be anxious for some wholesome food; and when the desire for the discussion of political and social interests, natural to an intellectual people, will revive, and may be safely and moderately indulged. Men qualified to instruct and guide the people, may then, without discredit, engage in periodical literature, without the fear of being dishonoured by low associates, without being compelled to lower their style to the taste of pallid or *blasé* readers. Reviews, in the first instance, and then weekly papers will, it is hoped, recommence the political education of the nation, and the rational and reflective criticism of the Government; and when the tone and character of the newspaper press has been restored, daily journals may follow with comparative safety and hope of patriotic service. These are the hopes of the more

thoughtful of the French politicians, and the belief of many. The present restrictions, they say, are only fitted to a state of crises and transition, and are to be judged of only as provisional and temporary. If, when order is fully re-established, they are not judiciously and gradually relaxed, discontent and resistance will ultimately ensue. France cannot, ought not, will not submit to be permanently deprived of free discussion.

It is the opinion of many of the most experienced and philosophical observers in France that the Emperor has before him a rich harvest of splendid possibilities if he has the talents, the judgment, and the patriotism to see them and to strive for them. His position is one of enormous and almost unparalleled advantages. He has the power of an oriental despot added to the sanction of the almost unanimous choice of the people. He has no rival and no opposition. He has arrived at supreme authority at a moment when France, worn out with strife and tumult, and alarmed at the prospect of anarchy which a year ago menaced them so fiercely, is clamorous at once for a master and a protector. One point in his character is especially relied on; people are satisfied that he will shrink from *nothing* which is requisite to maintain order, and suppress insurrection; that he will not, like Louis Philippe, cast down his power from want of nerve or resolution to maintain it. We found that the burden of conversation on every side was the same—"We are weary of ceaseless and purposeless strife; we are sick of politics; we can no longer bear to live under the harass of perpetual alarms—alarms which those who know what fearful elements of mischief and disorganization exist in French society—how full is Paris, and indeed nearly all France, of liberated galley-slaves, of fanatic socialists, of escaped or pardoned insurrectionists—are little disposed to deride as unfounded or exaggerated." With a nation in this prostrate, fatigued, and obedient state of mind, with power as unlimited as his, and with a resolute and unrelenting will, the Emperor *may* do much—everything for France. *Will* he? Has he the capacity? Has he the knowledge? Has he the due sense of his position? His friends and the cooler and more hopeful observers (who, however, are seldom very numerous in France) reason thus, in a tone which in some is little more than wish, and in others rises into sanguine anticipation, and almost into prophecy:—that the present tyranny is only transitional, adapted to a dangerous crisis and a deep-seated malady, and must be judged as such; that a

period of stern and iron rule is absolutely necessary in order to crush into absolute hopelessness all insurrectionary and revolutionary parties, and to give time for the turbid and muddy elements of society to settle down into calm stagnation, and for the great central ideas of religion, of duty, of patriotism, of family, to take root again in the mind of the nation; that some years devoted to repose, to recovery, to the pursuit of national prosperity, must be allowed before France is ready again for the efforts and the sacrifices of citizenship; that, in fact, an interval of calm as rigid and unbroken as the grave, is an indispensable vestibule to a better, a serener, and a healthier life. They urge, moreover, that gradual improvements may be ingrafted on a stable Government, and gradual liberties may be wrung out of a despotic one; but that all history, and French history most of all, too clearly shows that from the overthrow of authority, neither freedom nor order can arise, and that revolution can only, after much tribulation and many sufferings, terminate in restoration. The nation has twice, at least, had *carte blanche* as to its own future, and both times it has failed to construct anything fitted or desirable to last. They affirm, too, that Louis Napoleon has a clear perception of the needs of France, and has planned several reforms which will be abiding blessings to the country, long after he and his dynasty shall have passed away. Finally, they declare, and we believe with perfect truth, that there exists now in France a strong reactionary tendency, an increasing and spreading conviction that something of the past must be recalled before an enduring basis for any political system can be laid; that whatever of loyalty, of chivalry, of religious sincerity yet remains in France must be satisfied, embraced, and enlisted, in any Government that is to remain. Their hope and wish, therefore,—the solution of affairs which alone seems to them to offer a rational and vivid prospect of permanent good and ultimate tranquillity,—is, that the Emperor, having done his work of pacifying, consolidating and compressing France, and laying broad and deep the foundation of an aristocracy of statesmen, and a *bourgeoisie* of prosperous habits and commercial propensities, shall pass away without direct lineal heirs; that he should be succeeded by Henri V., who will rally to the re-established throne the clergy and the Legitimists, and that he in his turn dying without progeny, the crown shall naturally pass to the Comte de Paris, who will regather the Orleanists under his wings. In this scheme, each party in France will have had its restoration; one by one the throne will

have gathered round it and attached to it all rival sections, the Imperialists, the Bourbonists, and the adherents of Louis Philippe's family; and the Republicans alone, too few to be important, will alone have been left out. Moreover, at each successive change of rulers, the French nation may easily, if it knows how, obtain an extension of its political liberties; and with the Comte de Paris will come back to power—instructed and chastened by the lessons of the past—those friends of parliamentary government who shall have survived to that riper day, and whose offences the nation shall by that time have forgiven. The cycle of changes, twice trodden with little profit, will at length have come to a peaceable and natural termination.

Republic - (1793.)	Republic - (1848.)
Empire - - (1804.)	Empire - - (1852.)
Restoration - (1814.)	Restoration - () ?
Orleanism - (1830.)	Orleanism - () ?

But for the working out of this *euthanasia* of revolutionism, time, quiet, and the life of Louis Napoleon are needed. The chances of the future may be marred by three possibilities, war, bankruptcy, or assassination. The last—an accident on which it would be vain to speculate—would of course cut short all hopes. Bankruptcy might be fatal to him by the universal indignation it would excite among all that is respectable or wealthy in the nation, and how to equalize the revenue and the expenditure, without some such disgraceful catastrophe, is one of the knottiest problems he has now to solve.* Retrenchment and an income-tax combined—if he have courage for the one and self-denial for the other—may save him. Lastly, comes the question of peace or war—a most momentous one for us, for France, and for all Europe. Without peace, the calm and consolidation requisite for the reorganization of the country cannot be obtained. Does Louis Napoleon intend, and will he be able, to keep the peace? To answer this question we must consider carefully, first, his *character*; secondly, his *professions*; thirdly, his obvious *interests*; and fourthly, the necessities of his position. These are difficult problems for solution: on this subject, as on most others, accurate knowledge is not easy of attainment in France. "Truth (as Barrow says) cannot be discerned amid the smoke of wrathful expressions;" and the passions of those nearer to the scene of action, and, therefore, most favourably placed

* The *Moniteur* states, that the deficit of 1852 has been reduced to 40,000,000 francs, but this statement, like most official ones in France, must, we fear, be received with hesitation.

for observation, are still so violent and angry, that their statements and opinions are rather misleading than informing. Nevertheless, having had opportunities of ascertaining the sentiments of most parties in France respecting the new Emperor, and having, it is fair to state, conversed with five of his enemies for one of his friends, we shall endeavour to lay before our readers what, in our judgment, is the real state of the case.

In the first place, it is quite certain, and is now beginning to be admitted, even by his bitterest enemies, that Louis Napoleon is not the foolish imbecile it was so long the fashion to consider him. Those who aided in recalling him to France, and elevating him to the Presidency, under the impression that one so silly and *borné* would be rendered a pliant tool in their hands, soon found that they reckoned without their host. His *mind*, it is true, is neither capacious, powerful, nor well-stored; but his moral qualities are of a most rare and serviceable kind. His talents are ordinary, but his perseverance, tenacity, power of dissimulation, and inflexibility of will, are extraordinary. He is a memorable and most instructive example that great achievements are within the reach of a very moderate intellect, when that intellect is concentrated upon a single object, and linked with unbending and undaunted resolution. Moreover, his mental endowments, though neither varied nor comprehensive, are very vigorous. He is naturally shrewd, secret, and impenetrable. He has the invaluable faculty of silence. He has, too, been a patient and a wide observer. He has studied politics in Switzerland, in America, and in England: he has devoted his mind to that one subject. He is, too, a deep thinker. He *ponders* much; which few Frenchmen do. His six years' captivity in Ham matured and strengthened, by silent meditation, whatever natural capacities he may have possessed. He writes well and speaks well; and all his writings and speeches, even where they betray the narrow limits of his knowledge, indicate an eminently thoughtful mind. He has brooded over the history, politics, and social condition of France, till on these subjects he is probably one of the best informed men in the country, though, like most of his countrymen, wedded to many absurd and impracticable crotchets, which a better knowledge of political economy would explode.

It is certain, also, that whatever he does and says is his own. He acts and speaks for himself, without interference and without assistance. He listens to every one, asks advice from no one, gives his interlocutors no idea

whether or not their arguments have made the least impression upon him, but revolves his plans in the gloomy recesses of his own brain, and brings them forth matured, homogeneous, and unexpected. The minutest details of the *coup d'état* were arranged by himself. All those from Changarnier and Thiers down to Faucher, who have endeavoured to lead, drive, or govern him, have all been baffled, outwitted, and cast aside. When he rose at the table of Bordeaux to make his recent celebrated speech, he observed to his Minister for Foreign Affairs, who sat next him—"Now I am going to astonish you not a little." When he announced his intention of visiting Abdel Kader at Amboise, General St. Amand expressed his hope that Louis Napoleon would not think of liberating him, made a long speech, expository of all the evils that would result from such a piece of Quixotic generosity, and quitted the President quite satisfied that he had succeeded in banishing any such scheme from his thoughts. Nor was it till he actually heard Louis Napoleon announcing to his captive his approaching freedom, that he was aware how much good argument he had thrown away. Whatever, therefore, of sagacity or wisdom is displayed in the language or conduct of the new Emperor, must be credited to himself alone.

But we shall greatly and dangerously misconceive Louis Napoleon, if we regard him as a man of shrewdness, reflection, and calculation *only*. The most prominent feature of his character is a wild, irregular *romanesque* imagination,—which often overrides all his reasoning and reflective faculties, and spurs him on to actions and attempts which seem insane if they fail, and the acme of splendid audacity if they succeed. The abortions of Strasbourg and Boulogne, and the *coup d'état* of last December, were equally the dictates—like the legitimate progeny—of the same mental peculiarity. He believes, too, in his "star." He is even a blinder and rasher fatalist than his uncle. From early childhood he believed himself destined to restore the Dynasty of the Buonapartists, and the old glories of the Empire. He brooded over this imagined destiny during long years of exile, and in the weary days and nights of his imprisonment, till it acquired in his fancy the solidity and dimensions of an ordained fact. He twice attempted to pluck the pear before it was ripe. His ludicrous failure in no degree discouraged him, or shook his conviction of ultimate success. He only waited for another opportunity, and prepared for it with more sedulous diligence and caution. He "bided his time:" the time came: he struck and

won. After such success—after having risen in four years from being an impoverished exile to being Emperor of France—after having played the boldest stroke for empire known in modern history—after having discomfited, deceived, and overpowered the cleverest, the most popular, the most eminent, and the most experienced men in France,—we may well believe that his faith in his “destiny” is confirmed and rooted almost to the pitch of monomania, and that no future achievement, no further pinnacle of greatness, will seem wild or impossible to him after a Past so eventful, marvellous, and demoralizing.

Another peculiarity of his character is, that he never abandons an idea or a project he has once entertained. If he meets with difficulties and opposition he dissimulates or postpones: he never really yields or changes. Cold, patient, and inscrutable, he waits and watches, and returns to his purpose when the favourable moment has arrived. History affords few examples of such a pertinacious, enduring, relentless, inexorable will. This, of itself, is a species of greatness of the most formidable kind. If, then, to this delineation we add that, reserved and silent as he is, he has the art of attracting warmly to him those who have been long about him, and who have lived intimately with him; that, like most fatalists, he is wholly unscrupulous and unhesitating as to his agents and his means; and that he entertains and has deliberately matured the most extensive, deep-laid, and magnificent schemes of foreign policy, we have exhausted nearly all that we can speak of as *certain and reliable* regarding this remarkable man; and assuredly we have said enough to satisfy our readers that France has given to herself a master whom it concerns all European statesmen—those of this country more especially—to study closely, and to watch unrestingly. Cool, daring, imperturbable, cunning, and profoundly secret—a perplexing compound of the sagacious calculator and the headstrong fanatic—with a large navy, an unrivalled army, and a prostrate and approving nation, what is there which he may not attempt, and might not achieve? He never abandons an idea or project; he recoils from no rashness; he believes in no impossibility. Why should he? After the marvellous past, why should he doubt the future? He succeeded in the *coup d'état*—why should he fail in a *coup de main extérieur*? He believed himself destined to restore the Empire: he has restored it. He believes himself destined to recover the imperial boundary line, and to wipe out the

memory of Waterloo: is he likely to shrink from the adventure? It is said that he admires England and her institutions, and that he is grateful for the kindness and protection he met with while among us. Both we believe to be true; but when did considerations of this sort ever restrain a politician who believes in his “star?”

One other feature of Louis Napoleon's mind must be noticed before we can be in a position rightly to estimate the probabilities of his future career. He is a close and servile copyist of his uncle. He has studied profoundly not only the history of the first Napoleon, but his opinions on all matters of policy and administration. He believes, and we think justly, that Napoleon understood more thoroughly than any Frenchman of his day, the nature of the government which France needed, and the degree of self-government which she could manage and would bear; that his sagacity and *justesse d'esprit* on nearly all subjects of administration approached to inspiration; and that, if he treads in his footsteps, he may aspire to emulate his glory. This is a sentiment eminently misleading, and full of danger. The talents of the two men are so wholly different, the internal condition and, to a great extent, the character and feelings of the nation have been so changed by thirty-five years of peace and free institutions, that maxims and modes of proceedings sound and expedient *then*, may be utterly inapplicable *now*. The dazzling fame and the wonderful sagacity of Napoleon I. may be the *ignis fatuus* which will lure astray Napoleon III. to discomfiture and ruin.

The words of Louis Napoleon—that is, his public announcements and professions—unhappily can never be relied on as indicative of his intentions; but if regarded at all must be interpreted by the rule of contraries. By repeated and most flagrant perjuries he has forfeited all reasonable hope of being believed, even when he speaks with sincerity and truth. Hence when he proclaimed, “*L'Empire, c'est la paix*,” we are reluctantly compelled to put the announcement aside as conveying no meaning, and giving no clue to his real views and purposes. Other words, however, spoken and written at earlier times, and when there existed no direct or immediate motives for deception, may afford us the indication we desire of his habitual ideas, and his fixed, permanent, and long-matured designs. Now we know that long ago, at Ham and before, he repeatedly declared his belief, that he was destined to restore the Empire, and to recover the old boundaries of France. We know that before the Chamber of Peers he said, that “he represented a principle, a cause, and a defeat: the prin-

ciple, the sovereignty of the people as opposed to legitimacy; the cause, the Empire; the defeat, Waterloo." We know that very recently he held up as Napoleon's strongest title to the gratitude of Frenchmen, that he abdicated rather than consent to her dismemberment—*i.e.*, her confinement to her former limits. We believe, too, (we cannot say we *know*, because our information is at one remove from first authority,) that he has more than once avowed to his intimates his determination to have a page of history to himself, and his idea of realizing his ambitious dream by an achievement which no one since William, Duke of Normandy, has attempted. So much for his language.

His immediate and obvious *interests* all lie on the side of peace. With the great mass of the French people of all classes any war would now be most unpopular. They want rest; they want prosperity; they want time to devote to the restoration of their shattered fortunes, and the advancement of industry and wealth. They dread the increased taxation which war would inevitably bring. The more reflective among them—and in this class might be mentioned some of the first military men in the nation—deprecate a war, because they believe it would be a war of aggression; therefore, probably, a war against combined Europe; therefore, in the end, an unsuccessful one, and likely to be visited with heavy retaliation and certain dismemberment. The *ouvriers* know that war would put a stop to much of the public and private expenditure which now causes their prosperity. The commercial classes hate war instinctively as well as rationally. The railroads, and the constant intercourse they have encouraged, and the extensive intermarriages, connexions, and interlacing of interests which this intercourse has brought about—all cry out loudly and powerfully for peace, especially for peace with England. The turbulent and unprincipled journalists, who used to be the great clamourers for war, and the mischief makers who strove to fan every trifling misunderstanding into a bloody quarrel, are now effectually silenced. The Emperor is well aware of all this; the enthusiastic reception of his pacific speech at Bordeaux must have confirmed his previous knowledge of the pacific desires of the people; and we have had ample opportunities of ascertaining that his own friends and supporters of all ranks of civilians, deprecate war in the most earnest manner. Louis Napoleon is, we believe, sincerely desirous to promote the interests of France, and perfectly aware that a war would be most inimical to those interests. He also perceives clearly how dangerous and impolitic it would be for

himself and his position; and he has more than once repeated the argument we put forth more than a year ago when urging upon him a pacific policy, *viz.*, that war would be a suicidal folly in a civilian like himself; for that an unsuccessful war would destroy him, and that the fruits of a successful one would be reaped by the general who led it. If, therefore, Louis Napoleon is guided by his own interests, or by his own clear perception of those interests, he will not voluntarily and deliberately engage in war.

But we must take into account not only Louis Napoleon's interests, but his passions. Now, it is notorious that his anger is vehemently excited against both England and Belgium, and for the same reasons. Both countries harbour his personal enemies and the refugees from his tyranny; and the press in both countries has been unmeasured and unceasing in its abuse of him. Both countries he believes to be centres of perpetual plots against his government; and if he supposed that he could seize the conspirators by a sudden inroad, like that by which his uncle obtained possession of the Duke d'Enghien, we greatly question whether any motive of decency or prudence could restrain him from making the attempt. In the case of Belgium, too, his irritation is shared by a great number of persons in France; and with the French nation the strongest motive for an attack on Belgium would not be the territorial aggrandizement, but the hunting out of what they regard as a nest of calumniators and conspirators.

Now let us cast a hasty glance at those peculiarities of Louis Napoleon's *position* which may leave him no free choice as to the line of action he shall adopt, and may compel him to be guided neither by his judgment, his imagination, nor his passions, but by his necessities. The present prosperity of France is great, and the revenue is improving, but the deficit is large, and the public expenditure on a most extravagant scale. The unfunded debt is more extensive than is at all safe, and it is scarcely likely that a loan could be easily negotiated, at least in the open market of the world. Embarrassed finances, though in one point of view they may make war difficult, may, on the other hand, drive the Emperor into some rash and desperate step to rehabilitate them. A war in an enemy's country can be made to support itself; and a triumphant army abroad, besides the possibility of levying tribute and indemnity, it might be hoped, would cost less than an unemployed but fully equipped army at home. This may not be a very wise or sound speculation; but we know that men in pecuniary difficulties are

notoriously adventurous and wild; and something must be done soon to bring expenditure and revenue to a balance.

But the real difficulty lies with the army. *Res dura et regni novitas* may compel the Emperor to do what, if left to himself, and if omnipotent, he would most desire to avoid. Though it is not true that he relies solely on the army; though his hold over the affections and wishes of the nation is general and strong; yet it is unquestionably to the army in the first instance that he owes his elevation; the army is now the *active* agent in all political movements; and he must content the army if he wishes to retain his power. It is exceedingly numerous, reaching to nearly 400,000 men of all arms. Of these, Algeria employs at the outside 80,000, and Rome 20,000. The remainder are either employed as policemen, or are not employed at all. Now, the members of every profession wish for occupation: no man likes to rust away; and the members of the military profession long, in addition, for prize-money, and promotion, and adventure. Only a very limited number of them can be satisfied and kept quiet with decorations and pecuniary advantage; the others become only the more restless, envious, and ambitious. If we except a few of the older and wiser generals, the army as a whole desires war. It cannot be otherwise: it is natural: it is notorious. Part of the army is already disaffected, and can only be restored to and retained in its allegiance by the lucrative and tempting prospects which war holds out. If the President reduced the army to such a number as could be fully employed in Algeria, Italy, and at home, he might keep his hold upon it without war, but he would make irreconcilable enemies of the officers who were thus reduced to half-pay. If he retains the army at its present or nearly its present magnitude, he must, in order to satisfy it, and to regain and enforce his hold upon its affections or adherence, employ it. He must engage in war, whatever be its dangers, at home or abroad. When placed, as he must soon be, between the alternatives of disgusting the people by war, or disgusting the army by peace, he must choose the former; for the army might defend him against the people: the people could never defend him against the army. The people would be passive; the army would be active.

The army is even now notoriously restless and dissatisfied. The Algerine regiments are inclined to the Orleans family; many of those at home are strongly infected with Republican or Socialist opinions;—a war, especially a sudden, dashing, and successful war, would at once rally them all to the im-

perial régime. Louis Napoleon knows all this well. He will not like to be forced or hurried; and war may probably be his last card, but it is one which, sooner or later, he must play. His only security, and ours, would be in a disbanding of 70,000 of the most disaffected troops, and *the suspension or great reduction of the conscription for the next two years*. If he does not do this we may look out for the only other resource.

But Louis Napoleon may not only be driven to war as a matter of necessary policy, which, if successful, would consolidate his throne, and even if not immediately or brilliantly so, would postpone his dangers;—he may be driven to it, if his fortunes become gloomy, and failure and destruction threaten him at home. If he sees his power slipping from under him, he is exactly the man to make a desperate, even an absurdly wild attempt to recover it, by a sudden attack upon England. If such an attempt should be temporarily successful, or even brilliant in its failure, it would give him a new lease of power:—if otherwise, it would, as he well knows, dazzle the excitable and jealous fancies of the French, and impart a sort of lurid and *grandiose* lustre to his fall. At all events, if a landing were effected, and a serious amount of injury inflicted, (as could scarcely fail to be the case,) he would have gratified one passion of his morbid mind, and have gained a gaudy, though a stained and disgraceful “page of history to himself.”

To sum up the whole. All the obvious and well understood *interests* of Louis Napoleon dictate to him the preservation of peace, and the direction of all his energies to the development of the commerce, internal industry, and general resources of France; and he himself is perfectly, coolly, and avowedly aware of this. But he believes that, sooner or later, his *destiny* is war; he is conscious also that the necessities of his position may leave him no choice in the matter; and, finally, desperation may drive him to do what prudence would peremptorily forbid.

If, then, the new Emperor of France should be driven into a war, either by his restless ambition, or his imagined “destiny,” or by the necessities of his position, what will be the situation and what the prospects of Great Britain? It is scarcely possible that French aggression should take a shape or direction which will not, mediately or immediately, involve this country in hostilities. Louis Napoleon has too completely played the game of despots, too completely declared himself the unrelenting enemy of patriots and insurgents at home and abroad, to identify himself with the cause of Italian or Hungarian revolutionists; nor would he

be trusted by them were he to do so. The spirit of liberal propagandism, which formerly made France so formidable to the settled monarchical governments of Europe, has been crushed out of her by the repression and discomfiture of the Republican party in the nation. She is now no longer the scourge and the terror of despotic rulers, but their bulwark and ally—no longer the hope and champion of trampled rights, but their most ruthless and resolute oppressor. In case of a quarrel with Austria, Louis Napoleon might, indeed, employ or excite the Liberals among the different nationalities she treads down to make a flank or rear movement in his favour; but so arbitrary a temper, and so close a copyist of his uncle will not voluntarily embark in such a scheme. He wishes, no doubt, for the annexation of Savoy, but this for personal reasons we believe there is no likelihood of his attempting, unless by such an arrangement with other powers as would enable him to indemnify the Sardinian Government in another quarter. The seizure of Belgium and the frontier of the Rhine, or an attack upon England, are, therefore, the alternatives between which he will hesitate. Now, if he flatters himself, as he did a short time ago, that he can offer such inducements to the three great continental powers, as will make it worth their while to permit him to extend his frontier to Antwerp and Mayenz, and if he has *reason* to surmise any such connivance on their part, his first movement will no doubt be in that direction: He will pick a quarrel with Belgium, which in the present state of affairs would be a matter of no great difficulty, and proceed to overrun and annex her. This, England could not tamely submit to; she is bound by treaty to defend her ally, and would probably feel that her interest as well as her duty engaged her in the cause; though, if alone and unsupported, she could offer to King Leopold no effectual aid, and would incur most serious peril to herself.

Now, we have no means of *knowing* whether the three great powers, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, will be true to their engagements with this country, and are prepared *bonâ fide* and heartily to stand by the settlement of Europe as made at the Congress of Vienna, and subsequently modified by the erection of Belgium into a separate kingdom. But in the absence of knowledge, let us look at probabilities. England and France bear a very different relative position to the other great powers from that which they held during the last European war. Then Russia, Austria, Prussia, and England, were fighting the battle of legiti-

mate monarchy and settled government against revolutionary propagandism and popular sovereignty, as represented by France. They had a common interest and a common foe. Now France is an arbitrary Monarchy, and therefore the natural ally of the other arbitrary Monarchs of the Continent. England is the representative of popular government and liberal ideas, and though not their active propagandist, is known to be the friend and favourer of constitutions and free institutions in other countries. The position, therefore, of France and England is wholly reversed. England alone of all the great powers has retained her Constitutional Government; and that government has become far freer and more popular than it was. Belgium and Piedmont are her only real active wellwishers, (for of Spain and Portugal we make no account; they would be wholly worthless as allies.) There can be no doubt that Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in their secret hearts regard both Belgium and Piedmont with arrogance and dislike, and would not be sorry to see them both destroyed as constitutional states, if change could end there. There can, we fear, be little doubt either, that these powers would, as a matter of feeling if not of policy, rejoice to see England weakened, humbled, and baffled, if no ulterior consequences were to follow. Putting aside, therefore, for the moment, the obligations of treaties which Royal ambition can generally find excuses to break through or evade, the question lies in this nutshell: which do the three great Continental powers dread most—the *military ambition* of France, or the *liberal ideas and sympathies* of England? Will they be most likely to ally themselves cordially with a nation whom they know to be the steady friend and earnest promoter of those free institutions and popular rights which they have everywhere crushed, and which they instinctively feel to be their deadliest and most undying foe; or with a chief whose interests, as against the people, are identical with theirs; who, like them, is the foe to constitutional freedom, who may, they will imagine, be kept in safe bounds during his life-time, and who will probably be succeeded by a legitimate dynasty, from whose aggression they will have nothing to dread? In a word, will they regard the army of France, or the revolutionists of Germany, Italy, Poland, and Hungary, as their most formidable enemies? The only link we have with the great powers is the fear of French aggression; all other considerations tend to link them with France against us. America, Belgium, Piedmont, and the patriots and

insurgents of every land are our only real friends and cordial allies, in the present position of the courts of Europe. Prussia is a commercial rival and a slippery ally at best; Austria hates us with a perfect hatred; and Russia has long fretted under the control which our maritime superiority gives us over her, as long as she has only one port and one available sea-board, and that one so easily blockaded as the Baltic. Whether these considerations will suffice to overweigh the memory of Bonaparte, and the dread of a possible revival of his policy, we cannot determine; but assuredly, they are considerations of the greatest moment.

On the supposition, however, that the three great powers combine to forbid to Louis Napoleon the desired extension of his frontier, and the absorption of Belgium and Savoy, he will be driven to his other alternative—an invasion of England. This, we can well imagine—especially as it need not, and probably would not, involve an European war—Austria would look on with delight, and Russia with suppressed and decorous complaisance. They would feel that there was no fear of the subjugation of England, and would not be averse to watch the two neighbours weakening themselves by mutual hostilities. The invasion of England, too, would, beyond question, excite unbounded enthusiasm in the French army and navy, and be undertaken with the most passionate alacrity. It would be enticing under every aspect; it would offer a prospect of restoring the balance of glory between the two nations; its success or failure would be the affair of a few days; in a word, it would be a gigantic and splendid gambling transaction. Moreover, Louis Napoleon might regard an invasion of England as his best card, on another view of the game. If he saw an European war to be inevitable, or if he meditated an aggression which would necessarily bring about one, it would be an object of immense importance to him to commence by crippling his most powerful, and impoverishing his wealthiest antagonist; and a foray upon our shores, if he succeeded in destroying several of our arsenals and burning our dockyards—even if every man of the invading force were ultimately cut off—would put us *hors de combat*, for at least the first campaign. Whether, therefore, the Continental powers are true to the treaties of Vienna or not, an attack upon England seems to be the most probable contingency of a warlike future, unless at least, our state of preparation should be such as obviously to render it a hopeless and a mad adventure.

There is yet another consideration, in one

view meriting the gravest attention of our statesmen. The aggressive and domineering spirit of Roman Catholicism has of late re-appeared in a daring and vigour which, a while ago, many among us never expected to see again. In Rome, in Austria, in Tuscany, in Piedmont, in Ireland, in England, and even in France, a disposition has been manifested, in no obscure or hesitating way, to play a bold and resolute game for the recovery of the old influence of St. Peter's Chair. It is impossible to doubt that each act of oppression or encroachment is a part of a deliberate, deep-laid, and systematic conspiracy against the spiritual, and therefore and thereby against the national, liberties of Europe. France has restored and still supports the Pope. The clergy in return support Louis Napoleon with all their influence, which is still great and most unscrupulously used. Now, not only is the Pope, we believe, willing enough, if not anxious, to urge on the French Emperor to hostilities with England, as the centre and bulwark of Protestantism, but the Emperor is well enough disposed to enlist priestly influence and religious fanaticism on his side in his meditated attack upon us, whenever he shall deem it expedient to strike. He looks to the welcome and assistance he expects to receive from the ultramontane party in Ireland, when his troops shall land there with banners blessed by Pius the Ninth, as one of his most powerful instruments of success. By representing an attack on England as a sort of holy *crusade*, he hopes to obtain the good wishes and, at all events, the passive countenance and aid of the Catholic party in every European State, whether the State itself be, on other grounds, inimical or friendly to us. Now, Spain, Portugal, Belgium, and Sardinia are even more Catholic than they are constitutional; and the introduction of a religious element into the question, if the Pope makes skilful use of the weapon, may greatly endanger our alliances with these powers, or at least cool their interest in our behalf. And when Louis Napoleon shall offer the army the hope of glory, booty, and revenge; and to the people the prospect of such plundered wealth as shall relieve them from the immediate pressure of taxation; and to the Catholics of Europe the opportunity of striking a mighty blow for the triumph of their ancient faith; and to the Catholics of Ireland retaliation, supremacy, and spoliation,—is he likely to want enthusiastic volunteers for the adventure?

One powerful and cordial ally in the struggle which is possibly before us, we have or ought to have. In a contest for

constitutional liberty in Europe, America ought to combat by our side. In a contest for British safety and freedom, we believe she would so combat, and in that case we need have no fear for the result. But we must remember that the Americans are a jealous, quick-tempered, and encroaching people, and that we are perpetually on the verge of some dispute with them, which circumstances might easily aggravate into a quarrel. We must remember also that the Cuban question hangs over us, and may at no distant time—unless American morality should be improved, or the American Government be firmer and more self-denying than it has sometimes been—involve us in a most painful and perilous collision. And, finally, we must remember that the sentiments of regard and consanguinity felt towards us by the United States, are no longer as vivid or as general as we could wish. For a generation back we have been pouring out upon their shores, by thousands—sometimes hundreds of thousands—every year, shoals of Irish malcontents, with inflamed passions and perverted minds, spreading their insane and malignant hatred against England through every city and parish of the land which has sheltered them, poisoning and turning away from us the affections of those who should have been our fastest friends, by their bitter diatribes, their fierce invectives, and their savage lies. Therefore, though we fully believe that in a real struggle for existence or for freedom, if it ever comes to this, England might confidently count on effective and zealous aid from America, we scarcely think that she could count on her active assistance in an European war, even if that war were waged, not for Empire, but for liberal institutions, for Hungarian or Italian emancipation, for trampled nationalities, or for religious rights.

Such are our dangers as they appear on a deliberate survey of our position, and as depicted in no alarmist spirit. Now, *what are our means of meeting them?*

We do not propose to inflict upon our readers any detailed discussion of the National Defences, for several reasons. *First*, because our article has already reached to such unusual length. *Secondly*, because the subject has been already treated in all its bearings, present and prospective, by naval and military men of high capacity and long experience, both in pamphlets innumerable and in the columns of the daily press, whereas we have no professional claims to speak upon it. *Thirdly*, because it seems almost impossible to arrive at accurate conclusions, even as to facts, on this momentous

matter; one military member of the House of Commons proving that we had at least 60,000 available troops in Great Britain in case of necessity, and another proving that not above 10,000 could be brought into the field: one admiralty official declaring the number of ships that could be fitted out or summoned home to guard our coasts, to be deplorably inadequate and few, and another affirming that we could, on the shortest notice, fill the whole channel with war steamers fully equipped and stationed within signal distance (or hailing distance, for there was a difference in the reports) of each other. And lastly, because we have little or no information to give our readers beyond what has been already published, and if we had, it is obvious that we could not make it known without impropriety and breach of confidence. Whatever is doing in the way of preparation, is being done quietly; and over the actual state of our means for meeting aggression, Government has wisely thrown a veil, which we do not desire to lift. We shall merely mention a few facts, sufficient to satisfy Englishmen that whatever additional means of defence the Government may think it incumbent on them to ask for, the British Nation will do well to grant.

At the beginning of 1852 our entire naval force, according to the best estimate we can obtain, consisted of about 540 vessels, (of which 60 were ships of the line, and 150 were steamers,) and 40,000 men. At the same time the French navy consisted of about 330 vessels, of which 40 were ships of the line, and 114 were steamers; these were manned by 27,000 sailors and marines. Now, when we reflect that our colonies extend over the whole globe, and employ an immense proportion of our fleet, while France has scarcely a single colony except Algiers, which lies close to her shores, and that our commerce, which our navy is required to countenance and protect, is many-fold that of France, we shall see at a glance that in *available* force the French are far a-head of us. Our navy is scattered over the world—in the Indian and Chinese seas, on the west coast of Africa, at the Cape, in the West Indies, in North America, in Australia, as well as in the Mediterranean and in the Channel. The French fleet may be, and generally is, for the most part, concentrated in the Mediterranean, and at Cherbourg, Brest, and Toulon. Again, the number of vessels belonging to the respective countries is no measure of their respective means of attack and defence, unless we could know also how many of these ships are manned and in commission, and at

home, or within reach. This we cannot tell our readers. But Admiral Bowles said in the House of Commons, in July 1851, that "it very rarely occurs that we have even a single ship at home fully manned and disciplined." In February 1852, he writes that "it requires six months to man six ships of the line;" that "a squadron of eight ships of the line, left by Sir Robert Peel fully equipped and manned, and intended by him for home service and the defence of our coasts and commerce against sudden danger, is either being reduced or dispersed;" that "our Channel squadron has altogether disappeared: we have one ship of the line and two or three frigates lying idly in the Tagus, but at home not a single ship manned or ready for sea, and any thing like instruction or exercise in naval evolutions has become wholly impracticable, and is apparently entirely lost sight of." Two months after, the Admiral informs us, in a third edition of his pamphlet, that "when Lord John Russell quitted office we had not a single ship of force manned and ready for sea in any of our ports," and that the subsequent "recall of the Lisbon squadron only adds one ship of the line and two frigates to a force previously *nil*, and that at least 5000 men are still required to man and render effective our home fleet, which is in all other respects perfectly ready for sea." The summary of the whole seemed to be that we had at that time an ample, or nearly ample, number of ships, but that they were either unmanned or unequipped, or absent on distant service.

At the same date—that is, a year ago—the relative military forces of the two nations stood thus. France had an actual standing army of 393,000 men, fully equipped and admirably trained. Of these 20,000 were at Rome, and 60,000 to 80,000 in Algeria, leaving 300,000 for home service or foreign aggression. Besides this, we must bear in mind that the regular army of France may be said to be almost illimitable. Every year, from 60,000 to 80,000 soldiers are disbanded, (having completed their seven years of service,) of whom only about sixteen per cent. re-enter the army as *remplaçants*. Under this system 500,000 men, perfectly disciplined, and in the prime of life, could at any time, under the stimulus of necessity or enthusiasm, be added to the existing force. To defend ourselves against this mighty army, or such portion of it as could be employed against us, our whole regular force amounted to about 130,000 men, of whom, in round numbers, 30,000 were employed in India, and 40,000

in our various colonies, leaving 60,000 for the protection of the United Kingdom. Of these about 25,000 are stationed in Ireland, and 35,000 scattered through Great Britain. Our reserves, for garrison duty, &c., &c., in case of need, consisted of 30,000 enrolled pensioners, many quite worn out, 14,000 yeomanry, and 8000 of the Dockyard battalions.

The artillery of the two countries was even more disproportionate. The French had 30,000 artillerymen and 500 guns for field service, ready horsed and equipped; the army of Paris alone, with less than 70,000 men, had 120 field-pieces. We had in Great Britain 7000 artillerymen, and it is asserted (and we never heard it denied) only 40 guns fully horsed and prepared. If to these facts we add the statement of the Duke of Wellington, that "for the proper garrisoning of our arsenals and dockyards alone we should require 65,000 men," and that "as we stand now (in 1847) not 5000 could be put under arms, if required, for any service whatever, without leaving without relief all employed on any duty;" and remember that since that date the regular army had been diminished rather than increased,—we have completed a bird's-eye view of a state of things which might well have prevented any cabinet-minister from smiling by day or sleeping by night, more especially if he had read and duly weighed the full import of the following pregnant warning by the Duke of Wellington:—"I have examined and reconnoitred, over and over again, the whole coast from the North Foreland to Selsey Bill, near Portsmouth, and I say that, excepting immediately under the fire of Dover Castle, there is not a spot on the coast on which infantry might not be thrown on shore, at any time of tide, with any wind, and in any weather, and from which such a body of infantry, so thrown on shore, would not find within the distance of five miles a road into the interior of the country. In that space of coast there are not less than seven small harbours or mouths of rivers, and without defence, of which an enemy, having landed his infantry on the coast, might take possession, and therein land his cavalry and artillery of all calibre, and establish himself and his communication with France."

Such was the position of affairs a year ago. Happily, a short time after the accession of the present Emperor of the French, this nation began to awake from its dream of blind security, and to think that, even were there no immediate danger, such a state of unpreparedness was not creditable to a country possessing such boundless

wealth, and exercising so vast an influence on the destinies of mankind. Our statesmen, too, of both parties, began to be uneasy, and to reflect upon the awful responsibility which would rest upon them, if any serious calamity, or even formidable menace, were to result from their strange apathy. We have not yet done enough to provide against possible contingencies, but we have done much. The change in our position, we believe, may be briefly summed up thus:—The fortifications of our military and naval arsenals have been carefully inspected and put in a comparatively fair state of efficiency. We have embodied and trained for twenty-one days a force of 30,000 militia, and have made arrangements for calling out 50,000 more next year. Volunteers have scarcely anywhere been wanting, and in most cases more offered themselves than could be accepted. Their spirit has everywhere been excellent, and the short drill to which they have been subjected has been more effective than could have been anticipated. They will form a valuable nursery for the reinforcement or support of the regular troops, and with the enrolled pensioners will suffice for all our garrison duty. Lord Hardinge has been indefatigable in augmenting the artillery. Instead of 40 guns, we have now 120 field-pieces ready for service, and, it is said, shall soon have 200. Two thousand additional men have been voted for this service, and 1500 marines for the navy. Lastly, the Admiralty have not been behindhand. The extraordinary activity in the French ports and dockyards has stimulated their emulation. Several large screw steamers are being rapidly pushed forward; and arrangements have been quietly made by which, in case of a sudden emergency, a formidable, if not an ample force of ships of the line and steamers can be sent into the Channel manned, to the extent of five-sixths of their full complement, with first-rate seamen and gunners, within a week of the receipt of warlike intelligence. It is true that this can only be done at the cost of great inconvenience to other services; but it is a satisfaction to learn that it can be done at all. The Admiralty authorities, also, are intent upon the preparation of a more just and popular system of manning our navy; and in future we are to keep in every one of our chief ports a sufficient force of men-of-war and steamers to secure them and the coast immediately around from attack. Every month puts our defences, both by land and sea, in a state of greater efficiency; and ere long we shall probably be prepared, not only to repel any attempt at a descent upon

our shores on a small scale, but to make it too hazardous for the enemy to be any longer probable. For regular war, or an invasion deliberately arranged and by a large force, we may expect such ample notice as will enable us to call forth all our enormous resources.

But though we are unquestionably in a far safer condition than we were a year ago, we are far from thinking that enough has been done. We must render an invasion of our shores so hopeless that nothing short of insanity would undertake it. We must bear in mind that if ever it be attempted, we shall have to guard against three attacks at once: one from Toulon, directed upon Ireland, and two from Cherbourg and Brest, directed against the south coast,—the landing and even temporary success of any one of which, would be a calamity scarcely to be endured even in thought. Therefore, we earnestly desire to see not only the addition of at least 5000 men to the navy, but such an augmentation of our regular troops as will leave us always 50,000 men in Great Britain, exclusive of Ireland. We trust that no ministry will be deterred by the dread of debates on the Estimates from proposing this increase to our force. We trust that no House of Commons, from shallow and short-sighted parsimony, will, by refusing it, put to hazard our miracles of civilisation, our national honour, our as yet unviolated shores. We trust that the reckless advocates of Peace-at-any-price and Economy-at-any-cost will not, by opposing what is necessary for our safety, sink themselves yet lower than they have done in public estimation. And, finally, we trust, that even if Ministers and Parliament and Economists should all shrink and be found wanting in this hour of crisis, the British People will urge them to their duty in language that cannot be mistaken, and with a unanimity which will not be gainsaid. From foreign aggression a nation of our boundless resources, if once fairly roused, has nothing ultimately to fear: from native apathy, haughty security, niggardly and narrow views, may come shame, ruin, and unavailing repentance.

In conclusion, in what we have said of the affairs of France and of the position of the new Emperor, we have intended neither to express approval of his conduct nor to hazard any prediction as to his future course. Of the former, we have spoken on a previous occasion freely and fully enough. We can never be the apologists of a Tyrant, even where the tyranny is welcomed by millions, and is a bulwark against a worse alternative.

France has before her only a choice of evils, and a navigation between two opposing dangers; and the chapter of accidents is always too rich with her, and her changes and vagaries too phantasmagoric and unaccountable, to induce us to venture on a prophecy as to how long she may rest in the one she has now embraced. In a despotism so stern, indiscriminate, and inglorious as this she *cannot* ultimately acquiesce: whether it will be relaxed by the wisdom of the Ruler, or overthrown by the impatience of the victims,—who can say?

ART. II.—*Discussions on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform. Chiefly from the Edinburgh Review; corrected, vindicated, enlarged, in Notes and Appendices.* By Sir WILLIAM HAMILTON, Baronet. London and Edinburgh, 1852.

It seems a common opinion that there is little connexion between the subtle reasonings of recluse thinkers, devoted to abstract speculation, and the actions or even the discoveries which are important to mankind. Books of metaphysics are thus cast aside as void of human interest. The Philosopher, notwithstanding, pursues his vocation, without expecting to convert the multitude to his manner of life. In each generation we find meditative minds, struggling to obtain the most comprehensive survey of the boundaries of knowledge, the deepest insight of the foundation of human beliefs, and the truest interpretation of the life of man. And when we look beneath the "shews of things," into the great heart of literature and social life, we find also that the intellectual agitation of these recluses has not really been unconnected, as it seemed to be, with the pulsations of that heart; that on the contrary those who have maintained the vitality of philosophical discussion have—as by a social law—contributed the force which has kept the sciences in movement. The small band of labourers on these remote mountain summits of thought have guided opinions and affairs among the busy multitude in the valleys below. Their adventures and employments on the misty margin of human knowledge, whatever its success may have been in adding to the store of definite and immediately applicable information concerning the grand objects of the survey, will not be overlooked by a profound student of the literature and institutions of a generation.

Abstract Philosophy—the expression of the deepest thought of the present, and the pioneer of popular opinion in the future—is a permanent intellectual want of the human mind. Its high speculations, even if conversant with an absolutely indeterminate problem, are always important in their effects, as a chief cause of the changes for good or evil in the literary, social, and ecclesiastical expression of the current tastes and tendencies. Philosophical labours, pursued amid colourless abstractions, deeply tinge the results of every other department of intellectual action. History, in short, goes far to confirm the profound remark of Coleridge:—"To the immense majority of men, even in civilized countries, speculative philosophy has ever been, and must ever remain, a *terra incognita*. Yet it is not the less true, that all the epoch-forming revolutions of the Christian world, the revolutions of religion and with them the civil, social, and domestic habits of the nations concerned, have coincided with the rise and fall of metaphysical systems."*

Those who possess these convictions, cannot fail to regard with interest the kind of stream which, in any given period, is issuing from this remote well-spring of opinion. They will recognise some connexion between the topic of Scottish Philosophy, and those literary, scientific, theological, and even political questions which more frequently occupy our pages. Scotland has, in the past, added not a few classic books to philosophical literature. Our country has produced some of the most eminent speculative workmen of modern times. A careful analysis of the present opinions—especially theological and political—of Western Europe and America might trace back some of the most remarkable and influential of them to the workings of these Scottish minds.†

* *The Statesman's Manual: A Lay Sermon.* By S. T. Coleridge.

† The Literature of Scottish Philosophy, regarded as a whole, has still to be collected and reviewed, and its history has still to be written. A valuable critical and historical essay might be founded on a review of that collective literature, including a summary of its performances, and a report of its "deficiencies" after the manner of Bacon. But a work so ambitious, and which needs so much learned research, is unsuited to an ephemeral Article.

We are glad to notice pleasing indications, even since this Article has been written, that our philosophical literature is in a state of growth. We refer to the recent addition which it has received in a treatise on *The Philosophy of the Senses: or, Man in Connexion with a Material World*, by Robert S. Wyld; (Edinburgh, 1852;) and in an *Inquiry into Human Nature*, by John G. McVicar, D.D. (Edinburgh, 1853.) Mr. Wyld's book contains the contribution of an unprofessional student of philosophy, and may be taken for a happy symptom of some revival, at the present time, of the philosophic taste among our

We cannot return to a region so nearly related as Philosophy is, to a Journal which aims at an independent and thoughtful appreciation of human affairs and productions, more appropriately than through the academic avenue formed by the writings of Sir William Hamilton. Nor, as a national Journal, can we more suitably foster the old Scottish taste for that study, than by inviting the attention of our readers to some of the phases of our national speculation, in association with the most recent performances of the living representative of Scottish philosophy. No well-informed person needs to be told of the connexion between the name of Sir William Hamilton and the most elevated intellectual service of this age. During more than twenty years he has, by precept and example, recommended abstract speculation to a generation by whom such pursuits have been almost unanimously proscribed as valueless, and has laboured, in the isolation of his chosen walk, to redeem those products which are exclusively intellectual from the popular charge of uselessness. For many years he has been one of the chief philosophical powers in British literature, and he is now recognised as the solitary Scottish conqueror in the realm of speculation. The Discussions now before us, together with the Notes and dissertations conjoined with the author's edition of the works of Reid, of which in a former Article we gave some account,* contain more speculative thought and curious learning than has ever before been discharged into literature by any single Scottish mind.

The world is indebted to the *Edinburgh Review*, as the original channel of the most important British contributions to Philosophy of recent times,—the comparatively popular essays of Sir James Mackintosh, and these profound discussions of Sir William Hamilton. The present volume includes the celebrated papers contributed to the Review from 1829 to 1838; and a remarkable Appendix of new matter which now appears for the first time. Six of the sixteen republished Discussions, as well as a considerable portion of the Appendix, are devoted to Philosophy. In the present Ar-

ticle we confine our attention to the philosophical parts of the volume. We make no allusion to very many important questions in theology, church history, and the theory and practice of education, which are discussed in its pages. We must, moreover, beg the special indulgence of our readers, while we try to conduct them towards the territory, hitherto almost unfrequented in Scotland, in which Sir William Hamilton has pursued his intellectual work as a philosopher. We do not ask them to take a part in the remote labour of lonely metaphysicians. But we do wish to induce them to join us in an exploring journey in that direction. If, before that journey is done, we have witnessed, as in a sunny haze, the champaign country, which a slight historical survey of modern British thought may disclose, that more animating scene may perhaps make some amends for our having to pass through one or two metaphysical tunnels of more than usual length and darkness, which lie between us and a satisfactory view of the structure which has been reared by this latest labourer in the region of Scottish speculation.

In which degree, it may be asked, has the literary and social atmosphere of Scotland been charged with the elements of intellectual life, during the *quarter of a century* within which Sir William Hamilton has been giving his philosophical opinions to the world? The answer to this question, involving, as it does, some reference to the earlier Scottish and even British systematic thought, may carry us over a considerable part of our present journey. In offering it, we shall view the intellectual character of this epoch in its connexion with the historical antecedents of which that character is partly the result, and then describe, in some of the doctrines of Sir William Hamilton, the most recent expression which our insular and national speculation has assumed.

The opening Discussion of the work now before us was first published in 1829, when the sun of Scottish Philosophy seemed about to set. In the preceding year our country had lost in Stewart the most accomplished and least abstract expounder of the doctrines of Reid. Nearly ten years earlier, the brief and brilliant career of Thomas Brown was ended. Mackintosh still remained, his speculative ardour interrupted by the temptations of public life, although no narrow strife of party had defiled the purity or clouded the grandeur of a mind too capacious for mere sectarianism either in Philosophy or politics, and whose literary fragments excite regret only because they are so scanty and desultory. The eminent intellectual

countrymen. Without passing an opinion upon its critical and scientific judgments, we heartily appreciate the thoughtful, genial spirit, and freshness of observation which it manifests, as well as the intention of its excellent author. Dr. M'Vicar has issued an ingenious and original essay, which contains some curious disquisition and much suggestive thought. We shall not do the able writer the great injustice of offering at present, or in this form, any detailed opinion upon the contents of his work. We recommend it emphatically to the attention of all our philosophical readers.

* See *North British Review*, No. XIX.

ability of the elder Mill is, notwithstanding his Scottish birth, more properly associated with South Britain, and neither the acute work of Ballantyne, nor the empiricism of the phrenologists, requires any exception to the statement, that with Stewart, Brown, and Mackintosh, Scottish Philosophy seemed, twenty years since, to be passing away.

Nor does a greatly different verdict seem called for, as regards the national life in intellectual pursuits, when we consider the productions of the country, either in general literature or speculative theology, now and in the intervening period. With the operations of Scott and Jeffrey, the most obtrusive and characteristic Scottish action upon modern literature ceased. Since Hume, there has been no Scottish movement among the principles of philosophical theology, of a diffusive influence extending over Europe. Chalmers introduced the vitality of a magnanimous and genial mind into doctrines in divinity, which, in the spirit of the national theological conservatism, tended, philosophically speaking, to assume a dogmatic rigour of the scholastic type; and, like Arnold in England, illustrated the suitability of Christianity to the ever changing social and intellectual condition of the successive ages of mankind. It is well if the watchmen of public opinion can still discover symptoms of Scottish progress in the career which he commenced,—congenial efforts of Christian manliness in the cause of high thought and expansive Christianity, which might guard our theology and ecclesiastical life, from the perilous isolation of a merely protesting, instead of an advancing and reconciling power. Must we say that Scotland, which in these years has been the scene of so much social, ecclesiastical, and religious activity, is in the calmer sphere of meditation and learned research, to follow passively in the wake of Europe or America, or, with abated mental energy and progress, to repose amid her old traditions? May we not put a more liberal interpretation upon the present phenomena of her intellectual life,—one which recognises the peculiar character of the nation, with its proper function in the history of opinions, and judge that, in an age of the dissolution of doctrines into their elements, it is good to find symptoms of the action of a law of doctrinal cohesion, even at the expense of the more enlarged philosophic sympathies? Whatever answer may be rendered to these questions, it must be congenial to those who are interested in them, to study the character of the new type of Scottish speculation, which has been in the course of formation in these twenty years, by an intellectual giant, who is all the more

conspicuous and remarkable as he now stands so nearly alone, in the ebb of literary activity in Scotland which has been apparent during this generation.

We cannot affirm that a corresponding ebb has been going on in England. The condition of reflective studies in the southern part of the Island seemed hardly more propitious than in Scotland twenty-five years ago. English Philosophy had been a blank almost since the early years of last century. It was needful to look across the gulf of more than a hundred years, to discover in the distance the great monument of speculation reared by Locke. Hartly, Price, and Harris are indeed eminent names in the interval. But for several generations, philosophic thought had lost its charm for the leading minds of England. It was expressly discouraged by her universities, where the Modern Philosophy was at no time regarded with special favour. Yet, on the other hand, a quarter of a century since, the Scottish mind exhibited chiefly symptoms of a speculative decline; while England was beginning to abound in the seeds of fresh thought, which have since produced no inconsiderable harvest, not only in metaphysics and logic, but in poetry, the social science, theology, and other departments cognate to Philosophy. It was then a period of transition. The aged Bentham stood almost alone, as the prophet of the worldly utilitarianism which was nourished by the philosophic teaching of a former generation. But England was summoned to a course of meditation, transcending her wonted mental experience, by the dreamy sage of Highgate; and invited to muse on the deep meaning and beauty of nature by the recluse of Rydal Mount. To these two fountains, aided by some tributary streams, no small part of what is peculiar to the national thought and literature in this generation may be traced. But even with the help of Scottish gravitation towards the British metropolis, the generation has not sent forth a master mind of mark enough to take a place in Philosophy in the ranks of the intellectual grandees of England, beside her own Bacon or Locke.

An important chapter in modern intellectual history might, however, be formed out of the materials presented in the social and literary history of South Britain during these years. Strange tides of opinion have been passing through many minds, moving old institutions and traditions, and gradually depositing a literature as different in its character from that to which the preceding period was accustomed, as the external arrangements of life in this country now are different from their state in the days of our fa-

thers. It has been to England a period of the revival of theoretic principles, good and evil, into life, all over the substratum of the national mind. These principles, with their implied logical consequences, have been struggling into practice, with not a little of that force and consistency of purpose which earnest conviction directs against the seductions of ease and present expediency. Theories—the upheavings of the philosophic mind, have risen in greater number and force in England in these times than since the great revolution. The present fermentation of opinions is, indeed, a signal illustration of the power of general principles, to modify even the practices and institutions which are discovered to be at variance with the logical results of speculation; and to produce an epoch which can least of all dispense with those comprehensive minds, whose function is to guide wisely the revolution needed to reconcile concrete social institutions with abstract doctrines. Free reflection is directed towards the depths of political, ecclesiastical, and theological questions. The organization of labour, and of national and international society, is discussed in many quarters in a manner which forces the disputants within the province of Philosophy. The recent history of ecclesiastical affairs suggests many applications of the meditative habit of mind to the problems of the Church. Nowhere, perhaps, on the ecclesiastical horizon, can the philosophic observer discover an object which better deserves his patient study than the Church of England, with its singularly complicated and anomalous external and internal relations; and containing elements now galvanized into a mutually destructive life, after the almost unbroken slumber of nearly two centuries. It is probably the region of theological controversy which presents the most obvious signs of the spread of a bold and novel intellectual life. The old questions of the criterion of certainty and the rule of faith, are raised in treatises by learned ecclesiastics, and in others, by philosophical religionists, all conducting towards a state of opinion, in which the principles of the Reformation seem destined to undergo a more searching scrutiny, by Romanists on the one side, and Rationalists on the other, than they have experienced in this country since the Western Churches revolted from Rome.

Nor is the change in Continental less than it has been in English thoughtful literature, during the last quarter of a century, but it has gone in an opposite direction. In the earlier part of that period, Schelling and Hegel were conspicuous, among a host of less notable names, as philosophical leaders

in Germany; and Cousin was the centre of the most brilliant and numerous circle of thinkers which France has known since the decline of the Cartesian school. Now, after a course of speculation the most active and extravagant which modern times have witnessed, Philosophy appears at last in a state of collapse in Germany, and political revolution has meanwhile silenced its voice in France. The dark cloud of civil and ecclesiastical despotism gathers over the nations of the Continent most prolific of letters. We are reminded of the gradual decay of Philosophy, when the universal mind of the West was formerly wasting beneath the corrupt rule of the Roman emperors, and of the calamities of Boethius, in an age which illustrated the connexion of intellectual decline with the departure of christian manliness. For the valuable reflective research of the future, as for the other seeds of human progress, we are apt, when we look around, to turn from the country of Leibnitz and that of Malebranche, to the land which produced Bacon, and Locke, and Reid.

But symptoms of the action of recent German and French Philosophy upon the British mind are notable in the present intellectual literature of this country. The philosophical methods and language which have originated in Germany, in the last seventy years, so fill the vision of some of the minds devoted to this study in Britain and America, that they seem to have forgotten the fact,—concealed in the past behind the cloud of German metaphysics, that we have a characteristic British philosophical literature of our own; and moreover, that many of these foreign doctrines, in spreading among us, are only returning to the land of their origin in a sublimated form. Modern Philosophy may, notwithstanding, be vaguely described as developed according to the British and Continental type; and the old Scottish was a modification of the British, with some important peculiarities. The following paragraphs, in describing the *rudiments* of English and Scottish speculation in the early history of each, may in part illustrate this statement.

When we ponder the deep convictions by means of which the majestic spirit of Bacon roused the mind of England, we find him guiding men in another step of that series, alternating between dream and waking—notionalism and realism, which the history of human intelligence presents. His works express the many-toned call of a great soul to break through illusions—to descend beneath words to their true meaning, beneath changing appearances to the unchanging generalities which mere phenomena may

either conceal or conduct to. But this call of Bacon was addressed, so to speak, in the national dialect; and in the tone of one conscious that the function of man is patiently to seek truth, rather than dogmatically to assume that he has found, and may systematically expound it. Man cannot, he would say, ascend at once to the apex of Being, and form an *a priori* science of existence, as if the knower were the lord of the knowable. He must ascend by slow degrees, and, as the servant of *experience*, surrender the luxuries of dogmatic hypothesis. Such was the spirit of Bacon. Instead of a finished system of his own, he characteristically offers a series of aphorisms and historic illustrations, which enforce the impossibility of exhausting Being in knowledge, the inferiority of the knower to the knowable, the broken intercourse in which the balance of this inferiority may with self-denial be gradually reduced, and a true communion between man and nature established. We cannot now pause in his company. But the reader who wishes to absorb into himself the spirit of that philosophy of which Experience is the watchword, may profitably return often to the *De Augmentis* and the *Novum Organum*.

We pass down the stream of time well-nigh seventy years, to exchange the art and spirit of Philosophy—the principle of progress contained, in the form we have alluded to, in these works of Bacon, for the scientific theory concerning experience, presented in the writings of Locke. The triumphs of Experience were becoming illustrious in physical discovery. But the illusions against which Bacon warned had not disappeared. Man was still lorded over by preconceptions through which he vainly tried to conquer his way to reality. Even the current Philosophy of the age appeared to Locke to provide, in the famous dogma of *innate principles*, a refuge for notions which could not be traced back to what is real. Bacon had urged men to explore appearances in search of universal truths, and to abandon their preconceptions. But Descartes, Lord Herbert, and other leading thinkers seemed to say that universal truths might be found among human preconceptions, without the labour of a previous inductive scrutiny of appearances. The relation of human knowledge to Experience must itself, therefore, be scientifically determined. Their mutual adjustment, by means of an inductive study of our knowledge in its most general aspect, was the design of the imperfectly performed work of Locke.

With Locke and his associates the proper Philosophy of South Britain terminates. Ba-

con impelled men to search for a knowledge of the real through the seeming; and Locke offered an ambiguous solution of the question, whether experience is the only cause, and its sphere the utmost limit of human knowledge. The grand glimpses of Bacon, and the solid thought of Locke, are the chief excitement which the higher mind of Britain supplies, in the earlier period of its modern history, to the speculative tendencies of Europe. Careless of subtlety, and averse from what is mysterious, Locke has probably promoted Philosophy as much by the controversies for which the doubtful parts of his writings have afforded room, as by the doctrine which they unambiguously contain.* A psychological analysis of those two memorable minds would be a study of the English intellectual character. So delicate a process must not be interposed in this superficial survey of the main stream of speculation in Britain. We go on to describe an important passage in its course. That course was changed when the Essay of Locke became the aliment of a few Scottish thinkers towards the middle of last century. The circumstance seems to illustrate some of the points of difference in the character of the minds of the two divisions of this island.

When we consider the national character, we perhaps expect to find, in the higher intellectual operations of the Scottish mind, the tendency to test or verify dogmatic assumptions, rather than to seek for principles which may be assumed. We look for a searching logical analysis of theories, instead of the application to practice, of opinions received although separated from first principles and void of the symmetry of system, which is more characteristic of the English mind. We also expect to meet, in the productions of Scottish genius, a greater congeniality with what is purely abstract, a more entire submission to the march of merely speculative reasoning, and less facility to compromise with the other tendencies of human life, or to subordinate speculation to action. On the whole, one might anticipate in North Britain more angularity of philosophical doctrine, and a nearer approach to the extreme margin of knowledge, with perhaps a less genial de-

* We of course refer here only to the purely philosophical works of Locke, and especially to his *Essay*, which Sir James Mackintosh ranks as one of the four books "which have most directly influenced the general opinion of Europe during the last two centuries." But if Locke's *Letters on Toleration* are taken into the account, how greatly must the estimate of his influence upon subsequent opinions and legislation be increased?

velopment of the entire humanity, and less satisfaction in the *practical* solution of intellectual difficulties than might be exhibited in the south. England is likely to have a series of liberal thinkers, presenting various modifications of opinion; Scotland, a system of doctrine, definite and dogmatic enough to form the foundation of a school. The substratum of good sense, common to both nations, is perhaps more logically refined and purely intellectual in Scotland; richer, more pliable, and better adapted to practice in England.*

These somewhat sweeping generalities concerning the character of communities often fail in the application of them to individuals. But the quality of the intellectual work performed by leading philosophers of the two divisions of this Island, seems to us to illustrate some of the mental features which we have attributed to their inhabitants. It has been the function of the Scottish mind to supply, if we may so say, the logical digestion needed by the aliment which the great English philosophers have provided. If the works of English guides of thought exhibit freer and richer developments of all the elements of man's complicated being, and communicate through more numerous channels with practice, the fruits of Scottish reflection are fetched with more patient care from a narrower field, and are better adapted to satisfy a single tendency. Minds like Bacon and Locke occupy a point at which man and the world may be surveyed with a more ample sweep, in all the variety of sea and land; Hume and Reid explore, the one with a keener scrutiny, and the other with a more patient attention, the remote boundaries and intricate recesses of the province of intellectual Philosophy. These two Scottish thinkers may be said to have passed Locke's theory through the winnowing mill of the logical understanding and the common sense, and to have reached results which were overlooked in the more discursive

range of Bacon, and with the less purely speculative aims of Locke.

We do not mean here to resume the old story of the doctrines of these celebrated persons. A passing suggestion concerning the meaning of their respective performances, in the intellectual evolution of the national mind, is all we profess to offer. The successors of Locke in the South resolved Experience into sensation, and yet professed to give a scientific account of all human beliefs. A more rigorous interpretation of the English Philosophy, with a determination to pursue its principles into their logical issues, marks the singular specimens of Scottish subtlety involved in the scepticism of Hume; which originated, by a reaction, the "school" of Reid, and also, through Kant, directed the modern mind into a career of speculative action that is not yet ended. It is of course true, as regards practical conviction, that a system of universal scepticism can never be more than an "amusement" of the understanding; but every considerable effort by man to make his knowledge an object of scientific attention, and to discover its elements, is influential in human affairs, as well as intrinsically interesting. The great influence of these writings of Hume, upon the subsequent course of modern opinions in philosophy and theology, proves that his bold attempt to find what was implied in the current speculative opinions of his age may be regarded as more than a mere "amusement." And no one who wishes to study the different genius of the English and Scottish styles of British speculation should neglect to compare the "Essay on Human Understanding," with the "Treatise of Human Nature."

If the Treatise was founded upon principles to which the Essay may be said to have given currency, it originated in its turn a series of philosophical writings, which profess to discover other mental phenomena than those accounted for by the theory which Hume had found to hang together so loosely as to render a universal speculative doubt unavoidable. In Hume's interpretation of the current Philosophy, we see how British speculation, which awoke at Bacon's summons to men to cast aside *idola*, and to search for the real among the seeming, has, in the act of reviewing the real extent of human knowledge, condemned men to perpetual banishment from truth, by resolving knowledge into illusion. Faith must be revived and vindicated. Experience must be explored more patiently, in quest of witnesses to realities which transcend the "impressions" into which the Scottish penetration and subtlety of Hume had analyzed the account of human knowledge given in the

* The Scottish mind—its love for what is logically definite and exhaustive—its tendency to employ itself in the analysis, verification, or defence of dogmas, rather than in seeking for them without any prejudgment, may be partly the cause and partly the effect of the popularity of that systematic type of Theology which has educated the national mind since the Reformation. The Christian science of Calvin, with its moral weight and logical tenacity, has defined the limits of system within which religious thought has been conducted by the Christian guides of the nation. The consequent difference of national character seems to be illustrated, in respect to religion, in the small prominence of the reference to *doctrinal orthodoxy* in the English popular mind, when compared with the acute, if often dogmatic, recognition of "sound" doctrine, which has been associated with so much that is valuable in the better class of the Scottish peasantry.

English Philosophy. The recognition of dogmatic first principles was eminently a Scottish task. It engaged Reid and his associates. The retirement of a Scottish manse nourished the leading mind in this new school. For obvious reasons, the field selected by Reid, in his search for an evidence of reality which might repair the ruin occasioned by the recent explosion of speculative scepticism, was chiefly that part of human knowledge which relates to the world of the senses. Amid our very sensations we find ourselves, through perception, face to face with external realities which do not pass away when the sensations cease. Perception is the watchword or symbol of a dogmatic faith, which the reflective mind can vindicate, and which every mind must experience. "There is really something in the rose or lily which by the vulgar is called smell, and which continues to exist when it is not smelled. . . . Hardness and softness are neither sensations nor like any sensations; they were real qualities before they were perceived by touch, and continue to be so when they are not perceived. . . . Upon the whole, it appears that our (British) philosophers have imposed upon themselves and upon us, in pretending to deduce from sensation the first origin of our notions of external existences, of space, motion, and extension, and all the primary qualities of body—that is, the qualities whereof we have the most clear and distinct conception." These, and very many similar passages indicate the style in which Reid searched the human mind, in order to illustrate that kind of faith and intuition in which the mind gains a direct intellectual intercourse with the world of Matter.

It was thus that the speculative ingenuity of one Scottish mind employed the received principles of the English Philosophy to effect a dissolution of human beliefs; while the patient judgment of another revealed a profounder meaning in Experience than Locke had recognised. The philosophic ore discovered in England was, as it were, transmitted to Scotland, to be there tested by sceptical subtilty, and thus indirectly to give occasion to an energetic expression of the national dogmatic faith or common sense.

The period of the decay of the old Philosophy in England and Scotland respectively, has some analogies with the period of its manhood. The incipient decline of Locke's theory in the south is connected with the name of a writer, who merits credit for his attempt to apply an important psychological law to account for our knowledge. We refer to David Hartley, author of the "Observations on Man," an expounder of the phenomena of mental attraction or association,

noticed by Hobbes in the previous century, and the laws of which have since been popularly employed, in a sort of chemistry of *ideas*, to explain some mental facts supposed to be imperfectly provided for in the doctrine of the Essay of Locke. Hume has recognised the value of the principle, in the constructive portion of his speculations. And it is curious to remark, that this law of the mechanical association of mental states, which, entangled as it was with physiological hypothesis, engaged English Philosophy in its dotage in the last century, was discussed in this century in Scotland by Dr. Thomas Brown; and, freed from the incrustation of these hypotheses, has been by him applied as an almost universal solvent, in the formation of the ingenious system by means of which Brown beguiled not a few acute minds from the doctrines of Reid. Scotland thus again filled its characteristic office in the evolutions of British opinion.

But we have symptoms of a new type of abstract speculation in Britain, even before the old Philosophy of the country had exhausted itself. Germany, instead of England, now presented material to the Scottish logical intelligence. The name of Kant is associated with a revolutionary epoch in the history of modern European thought. The formalism of Kant, and even the absolutist dreams of his German successors, began to supersede the doctrine of the eighteenth century everywhere; and Germany was regarded by not a few as rendering a service in the modern somewhat similar to that rendered by Greece in the ancient world. Cousin, more than any other writer of the age, was giving a diffused popularity to the study of the new systems. It was, in these circumstances, amid influences to which his extraordinary familiarity with what has been written by philosophers peculiarly exposed him, that Sir William Hamilton presented, in successive instalments, his *Philosophical Discussions* to the British public. In these Discussions, the student of philosophical literature may note conclusions, and methods of searching for them, which recall Aristotle and Kant oftener than Locke and Reid. Their very language seems to warn the reader to transport himself to an intellectual position remote from the one occupied by the guides of thought whose works we have been tracing; and to indicate, that, in the silence of the old questionings which had busied thoughtful Englishmen and Scotchmen in preceding generations, the great Continental movement in metaphysics, which had reached its height twenty years since in Germany and France, was helping to give a voice to a new representative of our insular

Philosophy. The problems of the universe and of absolute knowledge, suggested by the terms "unconditioned" and "conditions of the thinkable," are substituted for those more homely researches into the history of consciousness, expressed by the once familiar terms "intellectual powers" and "mental states." Yet the reader of these Discussions may also discover in them some marks which attest not merely a British, but even a peculiarly Scottish parentage. He is thus reminded of their nationality, and also of the cosmopolite influences amid which they were produced, in the decline of British, and the crisis of Continental and especially of French philosophy.

At this stage in our review we should be prepared to offer some satisfaction to a variety of questions. What are the principal fragments of philosophical doctrine placed before us in the new Scottish writings? Do they fit together into an organized body of Philosophy? What is the relative proportion of original and derived doctrine which they contain? What is the method according to which that doctrine has been sought for and obtained? What the arrangement of the philosophical studies and sciences which they suggest? What the negative and the constructive value of that Philosophy, regarded as a whole, and also in respect to one or more of its subordinate ramifications? What important links of connexion may be described, between these extremely abstract discussions, and some of the more interesting and obvious pursuits of mankind?

With these questions more or less in our view, we shall in the first place try to describe the chief philosophical opinions of Sir William Hamilton, within the compass of a few brief paragraphs, and with some regard to what seems to be the mutual relation and relative importance of principles presented in his works in a fragmentary form. We may remark, however, that the occasional manner in which these doctrines have been introduced to the world, and the dense brevity of style which marks a writer who scorns to render himself intelligible to unreflective and illogical minds, combine to increase the difficulty of investing with a general interest a course of reasoning and contemplation sufficiently difficult to repel the multitude even in the most favourable circumstances, conducted as it is almost uniformly in the remotest and least accessible regions of speculation. Then, the systematic use of a nomenclature, constructed with a rigorous precision suited to convey philosophical meaning with singular efficiency to minds prepared for receiving it, unavoidably

confines the stream of abstract discussion within a channel from which it cannot speedily escape to deepen the common opinion or literature of the age. Symbolic language, moreover, may be stereotyped after this fashion in the narrow department where thought, as in the mathematical sciences, is conversant with necessary truth; but the scientific language of one age must be outgrown by the results of observation, and of fresh experiments in meditation in the next, in those truly human studies which deal with probability, and in which knowledge, while advancing, is still imperfect. The general reader is on the whole apt to miss in these Discussions the plain and sometimes ambiguous language of daily life, through which the ample volume of the thoughts of Locke is discharged, or the natural grace and beauty in which the most subtle and original opinions of Hume are presented in his Essays. He cannot meditate freely when the evolutions of his thought must be fitted in to the movements of a complicated machinery of words. But, after all, the inborn thinker finds congenial companionship in Philosophy, whether she appears in easy negligence, or in her academic robes.

The object singled out for investigation in the new Scottish philosophical writings is HUMAN KNOWLEDGE. The more precise purpose of a large part of them is, to unfold the most general and abstract Law or Condition to which our judgments must conform, and by which therefore they are limited. The problem more immediately examined in them is perhaps rather the *limitation of human intelligence*, than that which, under the designation of the *origin of knowledge*, has more or less determined all the chief systems of modern speculation. But the one of these problems is essentially implicated in the other, and both of them are involved in the discussions of Sir William Hamilton.

It is the uniform lesson of his Philosophy, that human consciousness admits only a limited knowledge, and that the Absolute and Infinite are merely "names for two counter imbecilities of the mind of man." The philosophic axiom, that an unconditioned consciousness, and an unconscious knowledge, are alike impossible, is everywhere proclaimed; and the assumption is formally defended and illustrated in the discussion devoted to the "Philosophy of the Unconditioned." That intellectual point of view from which the *limits* of intelligence or consciousness may be studied seems, in short, to be the one which affords the most comprehensive and harmonious view of these new Scottish speculations.

The task of the thinker, who occupies this position for his study of thought, is, to exhibit—if possible systematically and exhaustively, the necessary laws by which human consciousness, as such, and also in each of its different modifications, is limited. In this respect, the work of Sir William Hamilton is the supplement and counterpart to that of Locke. If Locke describes the various sorts of “ideas,” which are the immediate objects of our judgment, together with the most general classes into which they may be resolved; the Scottish thinker studies our judgments themselves, to find the conditions which must be fulfilled, in order that acts of intelligence may be performed in relation to any objects. If the objective element in knowledge was appropriated, and, in a measure, psychologically analyzed, by Locke; the subjective and necessary conditions of all conscious intelligence are selected for logical and metaphysical study by Sir William Hamilton. In British philosophy, Locke and Hamilton thus divide between them the two departments which belong to a complete reflective review of knowledge,—the *objects of knowledge*, and the *subjective limits of intelligibility*.

The Scottish philosopher assumes two distinct kinds of necessary limits to human knowledge:—The *logical*, or those which apply both to the mental act of intelligence and to real existence; and the *metaphysical*, or those which, in virtue of its structure, limit the human understanding, but not necessarily or universally the real existence to which the understanding may be applied. The violation of the former is impossible, not to the understanding merely; it is absolutely impossible. Absolute existence, on the other hand, may, and does, transcend the second class of limits; but as such it only transcends the limits of human intelligence. Our mental faculties are conditioned; existence is unconditioned. Logic is, in short, the science of those conditions of conscious intelligence which cannot be violated either in thought or in existence, and the fulfilment of which yields merely the *not-impossible*. What is conformed to these laws of logic is thinkable, and may be real; what violates them can neither exist nor be conceived in the mind. METAPHYSICS is the science of those limitations to thought which are not necessarily limitations of existence. All that is thinkable in the human mind, must be conformed, not only to the logical, but also to the metaphysical laws of our knowledge. But, in the realm of existence, though not in that of thought, there may be that which transcends the metaphysical limits of intelligibility, and which, while not intelligible, is real.

A large part of these Philosophical Discussions, and of the comments connected with the author's edition of Reid, may be said to be occupied with an analysis of the *metaphysical* limits of intelligibility; combined with *psychological* descriptions of certain alleged faculties or modifications of metaphysically conditioned consciousness, which are revealed in the mind of man, (e.g., perception, memory, imagination, with the laws of mental association, &c.) The Metaphysics is a Scoto-German supplement to Locke, and the Psychology is a scientific refinement on Reid and Brown. (The Logic, meantime, we cast out of the account.)

A *metaphysically-limited consciousness of phenomena* is thus in a manner the *element*,—the “*cogito, ergo sum*” of Sir William Hamilton's constructive philosophy. His task, as a metaphysician, is to find and classify the conditions by which consciousness must be limited. As a psychologist, he should discover and describe the various modes or faculties of our conditioned-consciousness.

The “relativity” of human knowledge, i.e., the metaphysical limitation of it, implies, we are told, the relation of a subject knowing to an object known. And what is known must be *qualitatively* known, inasmuch as we must conceive every object of which we are conscious, in the relation of a quality depending upon a substance. Moreover, this qualitatively-known object must be *protended*, or conceived as existing in time, and *extended*, or regarded as existing in space; while its qualities are *intensive*, or conceivable under degree. The thinkable, even when compelled by analysis to make the nearest approach that is possible to a negation of intelligibility, thus implies *phenomena objectified by thought, and conceived to exist in Space and Time*. With the help of these data, may we not discover and define the highest law of intelligence, and thus place the key-stone in the metaphysic arch?

When, for example, we try to conceive Time or Space—in order to determine the grasp of our power of conceiving, we find that we cannot realize either an *absolute* or an *infinite* conception of them. We can as easily “think without thought,” as construe to the mind an absolute commencement or an absolute termination of time; that is, a beginning and an end beyond which time is conceived as non-existent. Nor can we conceive either an infinite regress or progress of time; for such notions could only be realized by the infinite addition in thought of finite times, and such an addition would

itself require an eternity for its accomplishment. If we dream of effecting this we only deceive ourselves, by substituting the *indefinite* for the infinite, than which no two notions can be more opposed. Time can thus be conceived only in a conditioned interval between two opposite, (an absolute and an infinite,) unconditioned, contradictory extremes or poles, each of which is inconceivable, but of which, on the (logical) principle of *excluded middle*, one or other is necessarily true.

The law by which our notion of Time is thus conditioned may, it is assumed, be taken for the type of the *universal* law of the limitation of human intelligence. We cannot think *any* object or event either Absolutely or Infinitely. All thinkable existence must, in the act of thought, be limited by the mental conditions implied in an exercise of thought confined between these two contradictory, unthinkable extremes.

But the speculations of Sir William Hamilton are not merely negative, analytic, and polemical. They may also be illustrated on their positive, synthetic, and conciliatory side. They may be represented as the fruitful seeds of metaphysical discovery. Judgments, hitherto regarded as ultimate, may be accounted for by means of this elementary law of the limitation of thought. Philosophy itself may be advanced by the simplification and consolidation of its doctrines. Thus, the hitherto unaccountable mental necessity of attributing every quality to a substance, is merely a result of the Law of the Conditioned. And we experience an irresistible mental impulse to believe the existence of a cause, when any change is observed by us. But the theory of the conditioned virtually implies that we cannot conceive an Absolute commencement of existence. As a consequence of this intellectual inability, thus derived, we cannot conceive any change as a *new* existence, but only as a new form of an old existence; we are thus under an intellectual necessity to refund every new appearance into a previous one. But this mental weakness, and consequent necessity, is only the causal judgment in its most abstract form. That judgment is thus only a special result of the necessary limitation of thought; and the virtue of this theory of causality is said to lie in the possibility, which it reveals, of a reconciliation between the doctrine of FREE-WILL or moral liberty, and the axiom that every change implies a cause,—thus opening a new vista of progress to the metaphysician and the scientific divine.

These are specimens of the principle of metaphysical progress which is alleged to be

contained in this scientific demonstration of the limitation of human knowledge. They are presented in conjunction with a mass of subtle psychological doctrines, concerning the specific differences of the acts of human consciousness. If the mental phenomena are all 'conditioned,' they are not, on that account, entirely similar. Reflection, on the contrary, reveals characteristic features by which they may be grouped into classes; and reflective analysis, of a very refined sort, is applied to them by Sir William Hamilton, in the discussions which relate to experimental Psychology. In common with the elder Scottish psychologists, he confines his attention chiefly to that modification of conditioned consciousness which Reid calls *perception*. But he also examines, with singular acuteness, the laws by which conditioned consciousness are *associated*, and the marks by which the *representative* knowledge of memory and imagination may be distinguished from the *immediate* consciousness of perception.

The preceding paragraphs seem to contain a slight outline of the *scheme*, within which Sir William Hamilton may be described as exhibiting, in *fragments*, in his various philosophical writings, his doctrines concerning the metaphysical or necessary conditions of human consciousness, and the psychological modifications which that consciousness is discovered to manifest when it is studied experimentally. In the view we have given, it may appear that, on the whole, this new doctrine issues in a definition of abstract intelligibility, and a metaphysical determination of its necessary contents; rather than in a psychological induction of our varied and vital acts of cognitive intercourse with real existences—physical, human, or divine. The judgment, that Matter exists, is represented as unaccountable, and the theory of perception is cut short on the margin of most interesting questions. In regard to speculative theology, we are told that 'the only valid arguments for the existence of God, and the immortality of the soul, rest on the ground of man's moral nature.'

But what definite judgments, it may be asked, should be pronounced concerning this curious and highly abstract speculative theory, the parts of which seem to be formally united with the tenacity of the strictest logic? Scotland has presented, in David Hume, just one other reviewer of knowledge in its First Principles, who can be associated with Sir William Hamilton, in respect of his undaunted resolution to tread only and at all hazards on its extreme margin, as well as his perfect acquaintance with every part of

the ground he occupies ;—and of the speculations of Hume, we may affirm, that their intellectual force is not yet exhausted, nor has their design and meaning been fully interpreted. But what is the intrinsic value, and probable historic influence of this new, all-embracing theory? What does its presence in the great manufactory of opinion augur for the future?

It must be grateful to persons endowed with any expansive intellectual sympathy,—even apart from the question of their positive truth, to contemplate the existence, in our British literature, of new speculations, tending to excite the action of the higher mental faculties. Any book which is fitted thus to increase the quantity of active thought in the world should be welcomed. He who does not look to the philosophical writings of Sir William Hamilton, as to an INTELLECTUAL GYMNASIUM, forgets the chief office of all truly philosophical writing and discourse. The philosophic reader will not inquire first concerning the number of true propositions, contained in a speculative work; he will look to the amount of reflective power which the study of it discovers or tends to generate. Indeed, a contribution to society of fresh and better disciplined intellectual action, rather than the disclosure of hitherto unknown truth, has been, and perhaps must continue to be, the chief service rendered by this department of literature. The thoughtful reader of this class of books does not, it may well be, review the list of new doctrines which his reading has communicated to him, until he has reckoned up some of the changes in his mental experience which it has promoted. He will look within, to find the intellectual movement which the writing has favoured, as well as without, to learn the propositions it has denied or demonstrated. When he wants to know its character, he will ask, not only what satisfaction, but also what dissatisfaction it has occasioned in his mind,—what fresh longing to go beneath the surface of words and common opinions has been awakened—what ideal associations have been kindled—what new conviction of an end in life has been formed, and what old one deepened. Nourishment of this sort is what the truly philosophical taste craves for, and what the best guides in Philosophy have sought to supply. The vain show, or even the reality, of much miscellaneous information was the sham science against which the old Greek sages waged unceasing war. And they carried it on less by presenting to their disciples systematic intellectual results, than by making them feel the need for such, and the impossibility of the attainment, except through reflecting often and long upon fa-

miliar judgments, and the meaning of forms of words which might be current among them. When we watch the evolution of a dialogue in Plato, instead of obtaining at its close an answer to the question with which we started at the commencement, how often do we learn only that we have *not* gained it,—not that it cannot be found at all, but that the chase is longer and harder than we had supposed, that one discussion or even a series of discussions cannot convey it, that sometimes it cannot be conveyed at all from without, but must be drawn forth by reflection from within, and that this very work of reflection itself, to be successful, must not be the work of merely a day or a year, that it is rather the work of life, to be persisted in from day to day and from year to year, the symptom of a growing strength in man's reason, but of a strength which must become weakness, if it is separated from moral courage and calm devotion of the heart and will to God.

We believe it must be the opinion of every reader of these Discussions, who can rise above the sedative influence of system, penetrate through their novel nomenclature to its living meaning, and pass in succession the speculations they contain through a series of independent critical judgments of his own, that,—whatever be the truth of their doctrine, they at least tend powerfully to cherish the philosophical life. But this remark cannot well be dismissed without some comment. Two obvious qualities in the writings of Sir William Hamilton may appear on the surface hardly to agree with their possessing or diffusing intellectual vitality and power. One of these is, his extraordinary familiarity with the philosophic opinions of all ages and nations; the other, the method of doctrinal discovery employed by him in the formation of his own theories, which seems to press the life out of the very speculations to which it gives birth. Each quality has a close relation to the intellectual character of this age, as well as to the value of the new doctrine regarded as the science of knowledge.

The extraordinary number of proper names and quotation marks, accumulated upon these pages—especially obvious when they are compared with the pages of Locke, Hume, Reid, or indeed any of the other masters of British thought—indicates, even to the superficial eye, how frequently the fresh flow of original discussion is interrupted by allusions to Greek, Mediæval, Continental, or the earlier British literature; and by criticisms of the nature and originality of particular opinions held by philosophical writers. The author's own views are seldom

projected in complete freedom from the course of previous opinion, and usually they are blended with, or appear to be suggested by, some disquisition which has been found in books.

But these facts do not really subtract, so much as they seem on the surface to do, from the originality of the philosopher, while they even illustrate the relation of Sir William Hamilton to the History of Philosophy in advantageous contrast to a prevailing fashion. We know not any other writer who has proved in how great a degree books may stimulate the intellect into independent action; nor any recent philosopher who has interpreted the theories of the past and the present less biassed by an exaggerated opinion of the exclusive importance of history, or by preconceptions of the historic course of speculation, in its manifold phases in each successive age.

The works of Schelling and Hegel in Germany, of Cousin and the eclectics in France, the popular writings of Lewes and Morell, and even the ingenious work of Maurice, illustrate the manner in which the study of Philosophy is becoming a study of history, and how hypotheses about the past and future course of speculation are substituted for abstract speculation itself. But this exaggeration of the important truth,—that the material to be examined by the philosopher includes the course of *social* thought as well as the phenomena of *individual* self-consciousness, tends to realize the fable of the dog and his shadow, by annihilating in the end Philosophy and its history. Meantime it is perverting that history. The opinions of the past have been not a little distorted, in the attempt to fix them down on the procrustes-bed of an *a priori* theory of what the course of Philosophy in the human race *must* be. One feels as if he were breathing an unhealthy intellectual atmosphere, when he is taught to search, in a narrow modern speculation regarding history, for all the liberal thought which has been produced by the meditation of three thousand years; and he is apt, when thus confined, to long for the bracing exercise of a critical hunt over the open fields of the literature of the past. We cannot avoid deprecating the prevailing inclination to substitute a preconceived history of speculative and theological opinions, in the place of the mysteries of philosophy and the revelations addressed to faith in theology, which constitute the proper intellectual and moral aliment of the thinker and the divine.

The reader of the philosophical writings of Sir William Hamilton is in little danger of being seduced into inaction by either of

these illusions. Jets of original thought find their way through innumerable crevices in the massive and beautiful structure of references to the literature of the speculations of the world, which remind us that old philosophical opinions are not the chief part of Philosophy. And while the author often indulges in the luxury of a classification of systems, an induction of passages ample enough to vindicate the arrangement is usually presented. Matter extracted from previous writings, without reference to any artificial arrangement at all, is exhibited on almost every page, and in a way likely to cast the seeds of fresh thought in the minds of well-prepared readers. In the wilderness of learned reference over which we have to travel in certain parts of his works, we feel as if we were breathing a healthier atmosphere than when we are witnessing the brilliant historic panoramas of Cousin.

But we must not be tempted into any discussion of the principles with which the remarks we have made bring us into contact—the relation of previous results of human thought to the fresh thinking of the world, the crystallization of old opinion in its connexion with the safe formation of new, individualism or private judgment in contrast with the history of the collective human intelligence. We have still to consider the method in which the speculative structure we have been describing has been reared.

When we explore the literature of Philosophy, we find that some minds have tried to solve the perennial problem of knowledge and existence, by a series of demonstrations based on abstract metaphysical axioms, after the fashion of geometry and the other *a priori* sciences; and others on the contrary, by a course of inductive inferences, founded on experiments pursued in their own minds, in analogy with the method followed in physical research. At present we only refer to this fact. We do not raise the question, to what extent, by either of these means, the objects of philosophic study have been transferred from the indeterminate region of doubt and mere opinion to the narrow territory of certainty,—whether, in short, there is a nucleus of *certain* knowledge already formed within the proper province of the philosopher. But we may affirm that the philosophical aspirations of Europe, in the last two hundred years, have supplied illustrations of the experimental or inductive, and also of the speculative or demonstrative, type of philosophic investigation.

The mental science which is proposed in the Essay of Locke is virtually an Induction of the intellectual phenomena under the

name of *ideas*. In that treatise Locke states, and then attempts to verify, the inductive hypothesis—that *experience* is sufficient to account for human knowledge. The statement is contained in the opening chapters of the second book; and the author afterwards tests his hypothesis upon some of those mental facts, (*e. g.*, our ideas of space, time, number, infinity, power, substance, the material world, and the Divine Being,) which seem most difficult of solution by means of experience. We find Reid, too, in all his principal works, engaged in an observational scrutiny of selected acts of his own mind, which thus yielded to him information and inferences that Locke had failed to note. The region in which the observations and experiments of these and other congenial inquirers was carried on is not, indeed, as with the astronomer or chemist, one which abounds in solid and extended objects. Notwithstanding, it is the method of inductive research which is applied by them to its evanescent phenomena.

But we follow a different method when we accompany Spinoza and Hegel, or even Descartes and Leibnitz, from their principles to their conclusions. We are not now putting an inductive interpretation upon mental events; we seem instead to be evolving a series of Demonstrations from assumed abstract principles. We have quitted the region of contingency and probability; we have entered on, and are confined within that of *a priori* speculation. But in the endeavors to exclude mystery from philosophy, by rendering a perfect logical explanation of knowledge, have we not separated knowledge itself from reality, and converted individual life itself into a step in the sublime demonstration? Hegel's extraordinary deduction of All out of Nothing, may be taken for a logical reduction and exposure of the attempt to solve the problem of knowledge and existence merely by abstract speculation; just as Hume, in the last century illustrated the insufficiency of the merely physical Philosophy of his age, by using its principles to dissolve mind and matter into a series of "impressions."

We incline to think that some of the more important differences between the new Scottish doctrine and the older Philosophy of the country may be traced to the *method* which Sir William Hamilton has employed in the interpretation of human knowledge, and the formation of the philosophical sciences. We refer, it must be added, rather to the manner in which the views in his writings that are of chief moment have been actually developed, than to the principle of progress or mode of considering the objects

which he studies that has been formally announced by him. In the definitions which he has given, and more especially in his elaborate contrast of Philosophy as conversant with "contingent matter," and "to be pursued on the hunting-field of probability," with Mathematics, which treats of "necessary matter," to be reasoned out in the iron chain of demonstration, he seems expressly to ally himself with those who have treated the principles of knowledge as a collection of mental facts, which might be resolved into classes through induction. Psychology is here the root, and other philosophical sciences (logic, metaphysics, ethics, &c., and whether *a priori* or *a posteriori*) are the branches which grow out of it. Human knowledge, accordingly, whether its ultimate principles consist of "necessary" or "contingent" judgments, is only contingently known by the philosopher, through the reflex observation and classification of these judgments.

But when we turn from these general statements and controversial discussions to study the actual texture of the new doctrine, we find in many parts of it a synthesis of necessary notions and judgments, and not a body of inductive generalizations drawn from mental experience. In some places we seem to be in intercourse with the most illustrious of the scholastic commentators on Aristotle, and not with a writer who lives two centuries after the revolution in the method of physical discovery which was inaugurated by Bacon, and announced as the principle of progress in the mental sciences too, by those masters who formed the rudiments of British Philosophy. On the whole, we appear to be in company with a guide in whose teaching the analysis and synthesis of abstract notions and judgments, as contrasted with the induction of real mental facts, holds nearly the same proportion as it does in the teaching of Descartes, whose *constructive* Philosophy is of the demonstrative type.* We feel that we need, in these circumstances, to guard ourselves from the risk of accepting demonstrative consistency in thought, as a ground for belief in doctrines which can only be contingently known; and from thus weaving

* The English reader may now, for the first time, provide himself with a version of the chief philosophical works of the great French leader of thought. The excellent translation of the *Discours de la Methode*, (Edinburgh, 1850.) done by a Scottish writer who has studied Descartes in the spirit of a true metaphysician, is, we are glad to learn, to be followed immediately by a carefully edited translation of the *Meditations* and some parts of the *Principia* from the same hand. This is creditable to the industry and ability of the writer, and we may add, to the enterprise of the publishers. It illustrates too the increased comprehensiveness of spirit in which Philosophy is now pursued in Scotland.

a web of abstract speculation, instead of unravelling the actual web of the human mind. Sometimes, too, when the reader expected to be hunting for legitimate assumptions, with help from the rules of probability and elaborate verification, he finds that he is asked to consign well-defined quantities of meaning to appropriate words, to connect in propositions the words thus carefully freighted with signification, and then to discharge and distribute these meanings, by the aid of logical definition and division, in the shape of highly-refined conclusions. On the whole, probably no other British philosopher can be named who has drawn so large a number of derived propositions from so small a number of assumed ones, using definition, division, formal induction, and syllogism so often and so successfully for awakening his readers to a distinct consciousness of what has been already assumed by implication; who has opened so many paths of argument too narrow to be discerned by common minds, and shed on each a light which reveals their former connexion with the centre from which they are derived; who, in short, conducts so irresistibly to his numerous conclusions all who have come within the magic circle of his premises. Neither, on the other hand, can we mention any other recent British thinker whose doctrines might more probably stimulate discussion and encounter opposition, if they are criticised as the final metaphysical adjustment of the great problems of the intellectual life of man.

Perhaps this curious discordance between the logical texture of the doctrine and the conviction which it carries,—and which justifies its character as an intellectual gymnastic, may in fact be accounted for by the inclination, especially manifest in his latest writings, which seems to draw our Scottish philosopher away from the old British occupation of adding, through an induction founded on reflection, to our contingent knowledge concerning mental phenomena and first principles,—into his favourite sphere of evolving deductively the necessary consequences of judgments which are assumed to be axiomatic. In saying so we do not mean to deny either the value of such speculative discussions, or that they may, indirectly, promote powerfully an experimental study of the origin, principles of growth, and limits of human knowledge. If only we observe faithfully “the constituted truths which consciousness immediately reveals,” before they are assumed for axioms in reflective science, we enter without doubt a rich mine of truth in this region of philosophic demonstration, and one likely ultimately to yield valuable inductive classifications regarding man. But

it is a mine into which the elder British philosophers have seldom entered;—unless Samuel Clarke and his school of philosophical theologians, or Hume,* who employs deduction negatively to illustrate the logical incongruity of the received dogmas, may be said to have done so; and it is moreover one in which thinkers may go far astray if their first step be a false one. He whose course of philosophical study consists principally in an evolution of the necessary consequences of such judgments, and who is thus elaborating a science of *what must be* in Thought, is in danger of excluding from his regard not a little of *what is* in Man, including those intellectual powers through which man gains his knowledge of things. He thus virtually separates Belief from Thought; and, finally, having eviscerated knowledge altogether, his Philosophy, instead of an inductive study of man regarded as a knower, becomes an elaborate deduction of the logical contents of a few abstract metaphysical axioms. But is there not a *something* among the First Principles of human knowledge—call it a nucleus of beliefs in real things or what we will—which cannot be derived by demonstration from the abstract and necessary conditions of thought, and which, when it is made an object of reflex study, must be collected in an inductive examination of the living mind by the psychologist?

We cannot, in our narrow limits here, pursue to a satisfactory conclusion these hints concerning the law of doctrinal discovery in Philosophy, far less apply that conclusion for critically appreciating the massive specimens of the fruits of research in the different departments of reflective labour which this wonderful volume exhibits. It is sufficient to indicate that it seems to contain the seeds of an *a priori* science of human knowledge, and that these seeds have so germinated in the more recent and elaborately developed parts of the book, that the experimental study of Man is well-nigh overshadowed by the elaborate structures of demonstrative metaphysics. The realities of existence are discharged out of knowledge; the abstract conditions of thought, with their necessary consequences and conclusions, are exhibited as a sufficient substitute. The illustration of our meaning must occupy nearly all the remaining part of this article.

But before we offer that illustration we may just refer to a great and as yet ill-adjusted theme, which is nearly related to the principle or method of doctrinal progress in

* But we do not mean to subscribe to Stewart's depreciatory remarks on Hume's manner of applying the experimental method in philosophy. (*Diss.*, p. 207.)

philosophical studies,—we mean the theory of the Classification of the Sciences, and especially of the philosophical sciences. This speculation becomes more needful as the division of intellectual labour is accumulating fresh scientific knowledge in different provinces of research; and, indeed, it must always be interesting to the truly philosophic labourer in any department. Additions to the number and bulk of those organized masses of knowledge, to which the name *science* may be appropriated, generate confusion, if their respective landmarks be not preserved, and if their mutual harmony be disturbed, by the development in one of principles which contradict those alleged to be discovered in another. The philosopher, moreover, is dissatisfied so long as he confines his thought within the province appropriated to any one of the subordinate systems of knowledge usually called by that name; he seeks for the One Science which absorbs every other, or, if that be unattainable, for the “*Philosophia Prima*,” which deals with the axioms of each, and justifies their separation into distinct yet united provinces. The modern mind has not been uninfluenced by these considerations. Perhaps the most suggestive and luminous of all the works of Lord Bacon is that in which he reviews the condition, prospects, and mutual relation of the various parts of knowledge. The progress of knowledge has occasioned many similar surveys, in Britain and on the Continent, in the interval since Bacon. It is the speculation to which some of the most eminent minds of this generation have devoted themselves. We cannot now discuss their suggestive questions or conclusions. Our readers may refer, for example, to the small treatise on *Method* by Coleridge, (which was meant to govern the arrangements of the *Encyclopedia Metropolitana*;) for the germs of much which has been taught since, in English literature, concerning the laws which govern progressive knowledge, and the classification of the sciences.

We should have been grateful to Sir William Hamilton for more help in answering a question so appropriate to this age, but especially to the present condition of philosophical studies, and to the important modifications in the old Scottish method of philosophic research which his writings sanction. Is metaphysics conversant with *man*, or with *necessary abstractions*? What is the connexion between the study of the mental phenomena—the inductive generalization of the *mental powers*, commonly called psychology, and a metaphysical criticism of the *necessary conditions of thought*? What is the ground in the structure of the living human intel-

ligence, of the *dogmatic assumptions* which stand at the head of the demonstrations of formal logic and metaphysics? Setting out with their respective axioms, the mere logician and metaphysician may construct *a priori* sciences, in a mood of mind as alien from the philosophic spirit as is that of a mere mathematician. We should regard an exhibition of the connexion between either of these studies and the great philosophic stem, of which they are represented as branches, as a valuable addition to the teaching contained in this volume; in so far as it might contribute philosophic vitality to animate the study of the symbolic formulas of the one and the abstract speculations of the other. This is a service as regards the former, not rendered by Aristotle, nor by Kant, and which is nevertheless needed, if the Ancient Logic, remodelled by Kant and Sir William Hamilton, is ever to coalesce with the inductive psychology, which has hitherto been characteristic of the philosophical sciences in Great Britain.*

But we must bid adieu to these general questions of method, in order that we may study the tendency of the new Scottish doctrine, in the definite metaphysical discoveries to which it lays claim. The ultimate law of the limitation of human thought,—the Law of the Conditioned—is alleged to yield these discoveries. When we are investigating the consequences which are referred to it, we may gain some insight into the spirit of that system of doctrine which they contribute to form.

Obvious illustrations of Sir William Hamilton's theory of the weakness of human intelligence are of course supplied by these perennial mysteries of thought—Space and Time. Their attributes have converted them into standing retreats for metaphysical contemplation and logical subtilty from age to age. Through these sublime avenues to the inconceivable, speculative minds have ever been ready to permit thought to wander, and to exhaust itself in the act. The varied specimens of the weakness of intelligence which are exhibited when the mind endeavours

* In this connexion we must recommend the study of an important work in the higher literature of philosophy—the *Prolegomena Logica* of Mr. Mansel. (Oxford, 1851.) In any critical discussion of recent English philosophical books, this acute and learned work should occupy a large space. It includes the substance of two articles, for which the *North British Review* is indebted to the author. Along with several other recent logical and metaphysical works from the same University, it proves an increasing energy and expansion in these studies in Oxford, since the period, a quarter of a century ago, when Archbishop Whately published his *Elements*—the book which has done more than any other to render logical studies widely popular.

either, on one side, to exhaust Space and Time, or on the other, to realize their infinity, supply the chief proof alleged in the celebrated controversy with Schelling and Cousin, of "the impossibility of a knowledge of the unconditioned."

But a more familiar kind of mental experience than any afforded by such necessary judgments concerning these mysteries is represented as also the fruit of the intellectual weakness which they so palpably illustrate. If, on the rare occasions on which we formally make the attempt, we find ourselves mentally unable to *exhaust time*, we daily experience the mental inability to *isolate a change*, that is implied in the judgment which inevitably forces us to connect every change with a CAUSE. The "causal judgment" is the most familiar and frequently repeated of all our judgments. It is one which we are forced, whether we will or not, to entertain, whenever we contemplate *changes as such*; and it is on the tide of this irresistible mental impulse that we may be said to be carried towards the inferences of common life—the general lessons of the physical sciences—and even the august truths of natural and supernatural theology.

This *irresistible mental tendency to attribute every change to a cause* is a specimen of the kind of FACTS which engage the study of metaphysicians. It has been an object of reflective scrutiny by philosophers for ages.* What do we mean when we judge that every event must have a cause? Why is this judgment *necessary*? The discussion of these two questions is especially associated with the early history of Scottish Philosophy. It may be said to have occasioned a third question, which is partly involved in each of the others, with regard to the *kind* of necessity of which this famous judgment is the expression. We may glance at the modern history of the controversies immediately connected with the two former questions, before we examine the speculation of Sir William Hamilton.

It was the doctrine promulgated by Hume—that causation is only succession, and that the alleged necessity of the causal judgment is the result of the custom, generated by daily observation, of associating events in orderly sequences—which roused Kant from his "dogmatic slumber," and also added not a little to the bulk of our British philosophical and theological literature. The

speculation did good service after its fashion, by proving the impossibility of discovering, through observation, more than various uniformities of succession in the changes of the universe. Does a "cause" mean a *tertium quid*, which may be perceived *through the senses* to be distinct from the mere succession of events? The illusion which might suggest this question Hume, Brown, and Mill have helped to remove; and they have thereby dispelled a haze which had previously obscured the provinces of experimental research. Observation of successive nature can only reveal phenomena succeeding one another. The practical recognition of this obvious maxim of the Scottish philosophers has illuminated the atmosphere which surrounds scientific observers.

But is the "causal judgment," then, the *gradual* issue of our experimental intercourse with an external universe, in which the events succeed one another in constant and orderly sequences, and is it formed in the mind, in these circumstances, either by induction, or by the force of habit? This favourite hypothesis, in harmony, as it is, with Locke's solution of all mental facts by means of the direct or indirect action of the objects of experience upon the mind, seemed insufficient to account for the irresistible force and the universality of the causal judgment; nor can observation, which only reveals successive events, account for the peculiar ingredient in the meaning of the word *cause* which is not contained in any modification of *succession*. Accordingly, the leading Scottish philosophers since Hume, with Kant in Germany and Cousin in France, have recognised, in this irresistible causal judgment, attributes which cannot be explained either by induction or by the habit of observing events, and far less by any single act of observation. With various modifications, they hold in common the opinion, that this curious mental state is due to something deeper than a perception of the changes in the external world, or even than the consciousness of volition and its results. Causality is, in short, a *necessity*, which, according to Reid, compels the mind to recognise a "cause;" according to Brown, a "constancy in sequences;" and which, according to Kant, connects events in thought as a condition indispensable to our thinking about them at all. But it is a necessity which they unanimously regard as an *unaccountable* law of the mind—"a primary datum of intelligence."

Sir William Hamilton coincides with these philosophers in the opinion that any modification of experience is insufficient to explain this mental phenomenon of causality. But he differs from them too. He professes to

* A history of opinions concerning the theory of Causation, in ancient, mediæval, and modern times, in the Indian and Arabian Schools, might fill a volume, and include nearly all the great questions of metaphysical science. We meant to have illustrated this assertion, but our space confines us to a slight reference chiefly to Scottish opinions.

solve the difficulty which has so long puzzled the metaphysicians, by means of that law of the necessary confinement of all thought "in the conditioned interval between unconditioned contradictory extremes or poles," which, as we said, he has copiously illustrated in our judgments concerning Space and Time. This alleged discovery is perhaps the most characteristic expression of the genius and tendency of the new Scottish Philosophy. Those who wish to interpret that Philosophy, in its deeper relations to the future history of opinion, must here be willing to descend beneath those forms of expression in which we daily give utterance to our irresistible causal judgment, in order to appreciate the subtle and ingenious interpretation put upon them by Sir William Hamilton. We shall here quote the passage in the Discussions which most effectively expounds the proposed theory:—

"The phenomenon of causality seems nothing more than a corollary of the law of the conditioned, in its application to a thing thought under the form or mental category of *existence relative in time*. We cannot know, we cannot think a thing, except under the attribute of *existence*; we cannot know or think a thing to exist except as in *time*; and we cannot know or think a thing to exist in time, and think it *absolutely to commence*. Now this at once imposes on us the judgment of causality. And thus:—An object is given us, either by our representative, or by our representative faculty. As given, we cannot but think it existent, and existent in time. But to say, that we cannot but think it to exist, is to say, that we are unable to think it non-existent,—to think it away,—to annihilate it in thought. And this we cannot do. We may turn away from it; we may engross our attention with other objects; we may, consequently, exclude it from our thought. That we need not think a thing is certain; but thinking it, it is equally certain that we cannot think it not to exist. So much will be at once admitted of the present; but it may probably be denied of the past and future. Yet if we make the experiment, we shall find the mental annihilation of an object, equally impossible under time past, and present, and future. To obviate, however, misapprehension, a very simple observation may be proper. In saying that it is impossible to annihilate an object in thought, in other words, to conceive as non-existent, what had been conceived as existent,—it is of course not meant, that it is impossible to imagine the object wholly changed in form. We can represent to ourselves the elements of which it is composed divided, dissipated, modified in any way; we can imagine anything of it, short of annihilation. But the complement, the quantum, of existence, thought as constituent of an object:—that we cannot represent to ourselves, either as increased, without abstraction from other entities, or as diminished, without annexation to them. In short, we are unable to construe it in thought, that there can be an atom absolutely added to,

or absolutely taken away from, existence in general. Let us make the experiment. Let us form to ourselves a concept of the universe. Now, we are unable to think, that the quantity of existence, of which the universe is the conceived sum, can either be amplified or diminished. We are able to conceive, indeed, the creation of a world; this indeed as easily as the creation of an atom. But what is our thought of creation? It is not a thought of the mere springing of nothing into something. On the contrary, creation is conceived, and is by us conceivable, only as the evolution of existence from possibility into actuality, by the fiat of the deity. Let us place ourselves in imagination at its very crisis. Now, can we construe it to thought, that the moment after the universe flashed into material reality, into manifested being, that there was a larger complement of existence in the universe and its author together, than, the moment before, there subsisted in the deity alone? This we are unable to imagine. And what is true of our concept of creation, holds of our concept of annihilation. We can think no real annihilation,—no absolute sinking of something into nothing. But, as creation is cogitable by us only as a putting forth of divine power, so is annihilation by us only conceivable, as a withdrawal of that same power. All that is now *actually* existent in the universe, this we think and must think, as having prior to creation, *virtually* existed in the creation; and in imagining the universe to be annihilated, we can only conceive this, as the retraction by the deity of an overt energy into latent power. In short, it is impossible for the human mind to think what it thinks existent, lapsing into non-existence, either in time past or in time future.

"Our inability to think, what we have once conceived existent in *time*, as in time becoming non-existent, corresponds with our inability to think, what we have conceived as existent in *space*, as in space becoming non-existent. We cannot realize it to thought, that a thing should be extruded, either from the one quantity or from the other. Hence, under extension, the law of *ultimate incompressibility*; under protension, the law of *cause and effect*.

"I have hitherto spoken only of one inconceivable pole of the conditioned, in its application to existence in time, of the absolute extreme, as absolute commencement and absolute termination. The counter or infinite extreme, as infinite regress or non-commencement, and infinite progress or non-termination, is equally unthinkable. With this latter we have, however, at present nothing to do. Indeed, as not obtrusive, the Infinite figures far less in the theatre of mind, and exerts a far inferior influence in the modification of thought, than the Absolute. It is, in fact, both distant and deliquescent; and, in place of meeting us at every turn, it requires some exertion on our part to seek it out. It is the former and obtrusive extreme,—it is the Absolute alone which constitutes and explains the mental manifestation of the causal judgment. An object is presented to our observation which has phenomenally begun to be. But we cannot construe it to thought, that the object, that is, *this determinate complement of existence*, had really no being at any

past moment; because, in that case, once thinking it as existent, we should again think it as non-existent; which is for us impossible. What then can we—must we do? That the phenomenon presented to us, did, as a phenomenon, begin to be,—this we know by experience; but that the elements of its existence only began, when the phenomenon which they constitute came into manifested being,—this we are wholly unable to think. In these circumstances how do we proceed? There is for us only one possible way. We are compelled to believe that the object, (that is the certain *quale* and *quantum* of being,) whose *phenomenal* rise into existence we have witnessed, did really exist, prior to this rise, under other forms. But to say, that a thing previously existed under different forms, is only to say, in other words, that a *thing had causes*.”—(Pp. 591-594.)

It is further maintained by Sir William Hamilton that the inability we experience to separate a *phenomenon* from its *substance* in thought, may be accounted for by the Law of the Conditioned, which forbids us to conceive existence unconditionally limited. But as he has not formally expounded the process through which the judgment of substance is thus imposed upon the mind, we shall confine our attention, in the remarks which follow, chiefly to his proposed reduction of the causal judgment.

This proposed analysis of the judgments of Causality and Substance is surely a singularly ingenious speculation, and one as comprehensive in its scope as is human knowledge, with which the mental facts, for which it professes to account, are universally blended. But serious difficulties seem to lie in the way of a recognition of this new doctrine among the articles of philosophic faith, as a satisfactory account of the meaning and necessity of these judgments. A few of these we shall now take the liberty to indicate. But before doing so we must remark, how difficult it is to inject a common meaning into the words and phrases proper to philosophic discussion, and to retain that meaning there in its original integrity. Nowhere are writers more apt to be at cross-purposes with their readers, than when they are employing the small stock of abstract words which are the instruments of speculation, but which living thought so seldom visits. The meaning which has been lodged in the words is apt to ebb away, even while the thinker himself is in the act of using them; and the mob of critics, who do not send the living stream of reflection appropriate to the vocables of philosophy through the pages of a philosophic discussion, necessarily reject, as unreal, a meaning which transcends the level of the state of mind in which they address themselves to the discussion. In our comments

we must not forget this general principle, as we hope ourselves to have the benefit of it.

When the great modern astronomer would verify the application to the planetary system of that law of motion upon earth which is illustrated in the fall of a stone or an apple, he vindicated its applicability, by proving that the rate of motion in the celestial and the terrestrial bodies corresponds. After Locke had announced his proposed generalization of human knowledge into Experience, he sought—in the spirit of the inductive method—for what we may term *crucial instances* of his proposed induction, that he might thereby vindicate experimentally his proposed theory. Now the explanation of the “causal judgment” proposed by Sir William Hamilton, which carries consequences so weighty in its train, may be studied from the point of view of that *inductive method* from which the Science and Philosophy of Britain thus drew their inspiration in the past. We may here accordingly refer to the Facts of mental experience. We may investigate that third question already raised,—what is the character of the “mental necessity” of which we are conscious in every causal judgment; and, especially, does it correspond with those acts of intelligence and belief which illustrate the highest law of the weakness of thought? There is one species of necessity with which we are familiar, in our notions and judgments concerning space and time. Thus we *cannot imagine* “an absolute commencement of time,” or “an absolute boundary of space,” although we may put in words an expression of the implied unthinkable judgments;—and we *cannot imagine* “a square circle,” for any proposition in which the implied judgment might be expressed is only an empty sound. The science of Geometry may be roughly said to supply a collection of specimens of *this sort* of necessary judgments. The contrary of these geometrical truths cannot be conceived or imagined.

Now it is here that, in the spirit of the British Philosophy, we may apply the scrutiny of the inductive method to the proposed theory of causality. Is the causal judgment the efflux of a mental necessity, similar in kind to this, for example, which reigns in the region of mathematical demonstration? Are we unable to conceive the absence of a cause, when a change is perceived or imagined by us, in the same way as we are unable to conceive a square circle or an absolute commencement of time? Sir William Hamilton has pointed out the weakness of the attempts to resolve the causal judgment into the Principle of Contradiction, which have been made

in the opposite schools of Locke and Leibnitz;—a method of proof in which it is virtually ranked among merely logical judgments, (analytical judgments *a priori*), and in which the metaphysician argues in a circle when he would make good his point. That every effect must have a cause may be proved after this fashion; but that every change must have a cause is not so implied in the meaning of the word change that the contrary proposition is a logical contradiction. But while we are satisfied that the *causal necessity* is thus to be distinguished from a merely *logical* or *formal necessity*, we are not equally satisfied that it may be regarded as similar in kind with the necessity which belongs, for example, to our judgments concerning space and time. We can only indicate in outline our view of some lines of argument which cannot here be described.

First of all, then, we hesitate to recognise the truth of the assumption that we are unable to represent to ourselves *in imagination* an absolute commencement—an unconditional limitation of *existence*; even as without doubt we are unable to conceive an absolute commencement or unconditional limitation of *time*. We do not feel that existence, as applicable to causality, can neither be added to nor taken from in imagination, just as time or space can neither be absolutely increased nor absolutely diminished in thought. We do seem to be able to imagine an absolute negation of existence at one moment and the existence of the universe in the next. In short, we do not feel, in the illustration drawn from “creation,” that we are compelled to recognise the necessity—for the imagination of a “previous form of existence,” as often as a change is perceived or imagined. And we are confirmed in this hesitation by the express testimony of Hume and the implied testimony of Reid.

In the next place, is not the relation of an effect to its cause conceived to be different in kind from that of a contained part to a containing whole out of which it has been evolved? Is the universe of *change*, as known, merely a variety of forms, implicitly contained in an absolute identity of existence? Varied illustrations might be offered, not easily to be reconciled with a description of the causal judgment, which asserts that no more is implied in it than simply, an assertion that the object in which the change is manifested must have previously existed under a different form: or than an inability to “deny in thought that the object which we apprehend as beginning to be really so begins,”—with the implied necessity to affirm “the identity of its present sum of be-

ing with the sum of its past existence.”—(P. 586.) Is not this to represent the causal judgment as an affirmation that every “change” must be only an apparent, and not a real commencement of existence—that it must be one of the many forms common to the only real, and yet unknown existence, which underlies them all? But does that expression truly exhaust, or indeed adequately represent, the meaning of the word *cause*, and of the affirmation that all changes must be caused? Here we must distinguish, it is true, between creation, and new modifications of created existences. But take any actual instance even of the latter. We witness the movement of a planet, and the phenomenon occasions a causal judgment. But does that judgment signify merely our inability to avoid imagining that the moving body previously existed in a different form? Rather do we not, through that judgment, express a belief, of which we can conceive ourselves rid, concerning things or real existences:—that there must be *more objective existences* in the universe than merely the changing object which we observe? The conviction of a cause is elicited, not merely by a constant succession of events, but also by a single or isolated event; and Dr. Brown, doubtless, has misunderstood the question, in so far as he has confined his regard to the contemplation of “invariable succession.” On the occasion of a *single change*, belief is projected, as it were, into the realm of things not yet observed, and of which we may never have any observation; but though we may, in consequence, remain always in ignorance of the special conditions of the supposed change, the conviction that *objective conditions there must be* still abides in the mind. This belief, or indirect perception, propels scientific research in quest of them. And it has the characteristics of a mental state, different in essential particulars from that which is experienced when we try to realize in imagination an absolute beginning of time, or the contrary of the mathematical axioms and of any of the necessary deductions from them. Further, that *change of form with an identity of existence* does not satisfactorily represent the contents of the belief which is implied in what may be called the causal state of mind, might be suggested by the circumstance, that the question concerning the *cause* of this universal flux and reflux of existence, and of each separate element in it, remains in unabated force, after each new manifestation of existence has been thus recognised in imagination to have existed previously.

Causality thus appears, in our actual mental experience, not as an inevitable *manner*

of conceiving, but as an inevitable expression of a human belief regarding real things, of which changes are symbols, and which are gradually discovered as these symbols are interpreted by science. And does not this belief forbid us to transform what is judged to be real whether conceived of or not, into the subjective issue of a mental impotence to imagine either of two contradictories—an Absolute or an Infinite existence? Surely something has been omitted in any description of the causal judgment which implies that a cause is merely a result of the abstract conditions which hinder human thought from realizing unconditioned existence. Are we not conscious of believing, and therefore of knowing, in the finite causes of the finite effects around us, realities, which may not, except by discharging the very life of its proper conviction out of our causal judgment, be withdrawn from this part of our knowledge? Are not the proper-objects of that judgment thus anchored, as it were, in a sphere, not beyond knowledge, where they resist the stream which carries the parts of space and the periods of time into the negation of an Unconditioned? If so they cannot be virtually created through the impotence of man to realize the Absolute in existence. Nature is known as a collection of finite existences, real although finite, and not as the result of a series of ineffectual struggles, by the imagination, to realize unconditioned limitation of existence in time. Are we then to recognise as specimens of the same universal mental law, on the one hand the inability to exhaust time in imagination, and on the other this alleged inability to exhaust existence in time, with its implied abstract necessity for conceiving every new phenomenon to be only another form of an identical existence? We are carried irresistibly, by a sublime force of the philosophic imagination, towards an Unconditioned time, when we try to conceive any finite period as the whole; this is, as it were, a wave of the philosophic imagination, surging up to its extreme limits. But it is surely on more than a mere wave of the imagination that we are carried back from a real event to its real cause. It is on the solid ground of the intellectual common sense, where we find ourselves in cognitive intercourse with existences, which the very causal judgment itself, as one of the manifestations of the common sense, forbids us thus to sublimate into the Unconditioned.

If, then, we contemplate the proposed Law of the Conditioned, in analogy with the spirit of the British type of philosophic method, as an inductive generalization, gathered through a series of mental experiments on our necessary judgments concern-

ing space, time, and ideal existence, it does not seem that we can include in that induction, a mental fact, which is virtually a judgment concerning real things,—a belief, suggested by every real event, that there is more real existence in the universe than itself. Belief cannot subsist in an absolute negation of knowledge with respect to that which is believed; although the needed knowledge may sometimes be only a bare judgment of objective existence. To know or believe that an object *really exists*, implies the addition of a new mental element, which seems to exclude the mental act in which it is essentially contained, from the range of a law that may account for acts of mind which relate to space and time.

In brief, it might seem that the causal judgment is *not* necessary to thought, if the word "necessary" means that we cannot realize *in representation*, an object non-existent now, and in existence an hour hence. But the causal judgment *is* necessary to thought, in the sense that we cannot realize *in belief* that there is no cause of a perceived change. Every object in which a change is observed, suggests the inevitable belief, that it is not the *only* object in the universe, and that the changes which it manifests are dependent on the existence of other objects. This inevitable belief, with which the causal judgment is charged prior to all experience, is a part of the mental phenomenon to be accounted for; and we may not assume that this belief *in objective existences* is contained under the abstract conditions of the thinkable, just as a belief in the speculative truths of mathematics is involved in the inability to realize *in imagination* the reverse of the successive conclusions contained in that science. In regard to causality, the problem seems to be,—to account for a necessary belief concerning objective existence, which, although not contained in the abstract conditions of the representable, is yet forced upon the mind even when it is in ignorance of the cause of any particular change. As in Logic, we find specimens of analytic judgments *a priori*; and, in Mathematics of synthetic judgments *a priori*, which we may call speculative; is not the Causal Judgment a specimen of a class of Judgments prior to experience and synthetic, yet not merely speculative or ideal, but charged with a conviction concerning what is real, and the absence of which can, moreover, be realized in thought?

But even if the causal judgment be evolved, like geometrical necessity, so that we cannot conceive a change, except as a new form of a previous existence, it may be doubted whether an inability to *conceive* im-

plies, or is equivalent to, a necessity to *believe*. In this view, we might proceed to follow the new speculation *deductively*—as we have already suggested how it might be examined *inductively*, and endeavour to determine the connexion between a conviction of real existence on the one hand, and a mathematical or ideal necessity of thought deduced from the abstract conditions of the thinkable on the other. Assuming the operations, in the mine of *a priori* abstractions, to have been successful, in the discovery that the ideal existence of a cause is implied in any possible mental representation of change, it is still a question whether we can firmly cross from the ideal to the real and objective on these lines of abstract thought. We shall not here engage in a kind of discussion which has often been already raised, for instance, by the abstract proof of the divine existence proposed by Descartes, or the abstract demonstrations of the foundations of Natural Theology, by Dr. Samuel Clarke and others. We are content thus to suggest speculations which bear some analogy with this new scientific demonstration of the necessity of a cause on the occurrence of a change.

But what account (it may be here asked) can be given of this inevitable causal judgment or belief? If it can neither be resolved, by psychological induction, into the Law of the Conditioned, nor deduced by scientific demonstration from that abstract Law, may it not be at least associated meanwhile with some other recognized order of our mental phenomena? We do not profess to offer any theory for the satisfaction of this question. But perhaps we may gain a deeper insight of the question itself, if we contemplate it in association with the universal tendency of man to believe in the existence of a Supernatural Being, whose attributes transcend human imagination. Every event which can be imagined—every conceivable addition, through the causal judgment, to our knowledge of real objects, leaves the mind dissatisfied. All visible changes “cry out” for an origin which transcends imagination. We do not, of course, in thus referring to them, account for either of these beliefs, far less for the one by means of the other. We only suggest, as a topic for meditation, the analogies between the conviction which is inevitably experienced when a change in any object is observed, and the mysterious faith in the existence of a First Cause, which underlies human life, and is developed in the study of those indications of intelligence with which the arrangements of nature are charged. Might not the recognition of this causal be-

lief, with its manifold forms, help to relieve the theological argument founded upon the exhibition of design in a finite universe, from the inconsequence of professing more in the conclusion than was implied in the premises? The primary theistic judgment is perhaps just one of the many modes in which our rudimentary conviction concerning the relations of real existence expresses itself. In its lower form, that rudimentary conviction may be manifested in what is called the judgment of Causality. In its higher or theological forms, it expresses our faith in the existence of a cause which transcends imagination, and fully satisfies the craving which every perceived change suggests. But, apart from experience, each form of the belief implies a knowledge of *existence* and nothing more. It is an expression of our conviction that every conceivable change—every phenomenon which begins to exist, is dependent on something beyond itself, so that if that “something” had no real existence, the change could not have been realized. And the profound conviction of the universal dependence of conceivable changes on an inconceivable Being or First Cause, might be elicited both by the act of Creation, and by the phenomenal modifications of the created universe subsequent to creation. The study of the particular antecedents of particular consequences by degrees adds intelligence to our original causal belief. Our vague supernatural judgment, too, is gradually matured into a conviction of the Personal God, through reflection on our own moral agency; through the study of the plans of the Divine Free Agent, whose designs constitute that *meaning* in Nature of which Science is the interpretation; and, finally, through intercourse with God in his miraculous revelation. That our elementary beliefs may be thus educated into an intelligence which far transcends their original dimness, we have ample proof, in the contrast between the rudimentary perception of matter, and the comparative blaze of light which physical research has shed upon the outer world.* Let us add, that this suggestion of the connexion between the belief developed by every change, and the belief in a Supernatural Cause of the universe may, of course, be combined with more than one special hypothesis concerning the precise relation of the Divine Being to each separate successive change. The rival theories of Occasional Causes, and a Pre-established harmony, at variance, as they seem to be, in regard to a problem which is perhaps in-

* The study of Berkely's *theory of vision* and similar speculations, may illustrate this sentence.

determinate, may continue their controversy, if it be really more than a merely verbal one; and different philosophical hypotheses concerning the transcendent meaning of a miracle, founded on these rival schemes, may continue to find favour. Thoughtful minds may meantime consider whether a study of the Causal, in association with the Theistic judgment, be not fitted to yield some nourishment for the growth of a Philosophy, spiritual yet not illusory, physical and yet not merely mechanical, and which might interpret the Ideas of Plato and the Forms of Bacon, in analogy with the style of thought peculiar to this age.

But we must return from this digression. We have pointed to some of the difficulties which seem to meet us, when we apply either an inductive or deductive test, to the new solution of our judgments concerning Cause and Substance, by means of the abstract conditions of thought. But apart from the question of its consistency with the facts of our mental experience, we are unable to reconcile these memorable speculations of Sir William Hamilton with the other principles of his own Philosophy. A recognition of the faith and intuition named Perception, for example, is represented throughout these writings as a safeguard against Scepticism, and perception is described as a direct cognitive intercourse of man with the material world. But what virtue or meaning in this faith, it may be asked, if a deeper insight reveals a higher law, which resolves substances and causes, and thus all finite realities, into results of negative judgments, involved in the abstract conditions of the thinkable by which existence is *finite*. The Unconditioned becomes the only reality; and yet the Unconditioned, as a negation of all knowledge, and thus of the knowledge of its own reality, cannot be an object of human belief. Even the vista of moral liberty seems to open upon us, only that we may witness the moral agents disappearing, with substances and causes, mental and material, in the darkness of the negative and Unconditioned.

We wait for a fuller development of the Philosophy of the Conditioned which might, we do not doubt, remove many of our difficulties respecting its harmony with mental facts, and its internal consistency. In the present slight sketch of the most recent evolution of the Scottish Philosophy, we have only indicated some of the tendencies which seem invincible, if an exhaustive theory of the necessary conditions of pure thought is gradually to become the universal solvent of the mysteries of mind. When the thinker withdraws himself into the sphere of abstract metaphysical demonstration, and yields to

its influences, he is apt too soon to be persuaded that, when thus engaged, he has been solving the relations of our real knowledge, and putting actual human judgments through the ordeal of philosophic criticism. A metaphysical evolution of the ideal conditions of thought, which does not coalesce with our experience of the intellectual life,—which divorces thought from existence—and seems to recognise a Belief that is wholly void of intelligence, has, we cannot but think, only imperfectly developed the theory of human knowledge.

Here at the close of this long disquisition, we find that we are hardly upon the threshold of our subject. In our course we have fixed our attention chiefly upon the principle of progress which distinguishes the genius of the old Scottish Philosophy, as that has been revealed in its historic rudiments; and we have referred to some symptoms in the speculations of our Scottish philosopher that seem to imply a departure from the method of doctrinal research by which reflective studies in Scotland have hitherto been characterized. Even on this comparatively narrow foundation of historical criticism, we ought, with a view to an adequate appreciation of these new elements of Scottish speculation, to study them in connexion with the critical method and system of KANT and the school of rational psychologists. And a just judgment of the elevated place which SIR WILLIAM HAMILTON occupies, as the representative of the national intellect, applied to speculations more abstract and comprehensive than any in which that intellect has hitherto been engaged, requires some favourable comparison of his philosophical fragments, and of the system into which they seem to form themselves, with the opinions of the two other great living masters of modern speculation—SCHELLING and COUSIN. But we should be giving a proof that we have not yet learned the most precious lesson which can be drawn from metaphysical contemplation, if we ventured especially in what must be the closing stage of our present journey, to explore these labyrinths.

The Philosophy of the Conditioned is exhibited in these Discussions in some of its *applications* as well as in its abstract character. But our space is more than exhausted. We had prepared some remarks, on the proposed employment of the new theory of the limitation of knowledge, in the work of philosophical and theological Eclecticism. An interesting course of thought might be pursued, in reference to the great outstanding phenomena of the controversies of opinion in Philosophy and Theology. As it is, we

would only suggest the value of some more precise and available canon of conciliatory criticism, than the proclamation of *human ignorance* concerning all which transcends contemporaneous and successive nature together with the abstract conditions under which phenomena must be represented to the mind. How can faith be maintained amid an absolute negation of knowledge, which implies a total suspense of judgment? Belief may consist with an imperfection of knowledge, but how shall it be applied at all to that of which we can know nothing, and which on this ground admits a conciliation of all doctrinal affirmations which do not involve logical contradiction? Philosophy and theology, in as far as they are regions of faith, and yet regions of mystery, can neither be consigned to the unknown nor be conquered by reasoning. Are they not eminently the middle ground, from which we wander, on the one hand, by a universal suspense of judgment, and on the other, by demanding premises for *every judgment* which we accept as an article of faith? Sir William Hamilton promises that "a world of false, pestilent, and presumptuous reasoning, by which philosophy and theology are now equally discredited, would be abolished" in the recognition of *our impotence to comprehend what however we must admit*. But as this principle has not been pursued by him, in its articulate application to the chief dogmas of theology, and as in itself it might suggest more than a long article, we shall only commend it to the attention of our readers. It is a great but profoundly interesting research which is needed, in order to determine whether doctrines of faith, apparently discordant in intelligence, may be really in harmony, and to detect those doctrines which, as mutually contradictory, cannot co-exist. The sanguine mind may fondly imagine Philosophy to contribute some help, in the Christendom of the Future, to undo, by a comprehensive conciliation, a part of its own work of excessive elaboration of dogmatic forms of thought and expression in the Christendom of the Past; and thus to atone for the increasing anarchy of sects, which speculation has encouraged in the Church, by a revision of theological science which should distinguish dogmatic forms that are *essentially exclusive* from those which *may co exist* in thought. For conducting the Church towards this ideal of Christian science, we look with more hope to the presence and slowly-diffused influence of individual minds, of the comprehensive type and animated with the Christian spirit, than to any synod or conclave of theologians formally met to adjust doctrinal differences.

In parting now from his works, we must express our gratitude to Sir William Hamilton, for the help which the results of his many years of labour must yield, to those who desire to promote expansive thought and the philosophic spirit in every department in which the human intellect may be employed. Whether or not the sons of Scottish thought, in coming generations, shall regard the philosophic watch-towers which he has reared for the reflective review of human knowledge, as those from which a complete and satisfying survey of the mysteries of our intellectual life may be attained, every true lover of such enterprises, in time to come, must wonder when he meditates on the logical symmetry of the work, or when he is led to occupy a contemplative position on any one of its unfinished monumental pillars, adorned so richly with memorials of the philosophic labourers of former ages. Even if he should terminate his study of this structure of Scottish speculative genius, in the opinion that it affords no position for a full review of knowledge, and that it closes the region of faith against the eye of intelligence, he must still go forth from his meditations among these master-works of one of the most extraordinary minds of modern times, in a humbler spirit, and move thereafter with a more cautious tread, when he has returned to take his part either in the vexing controversies of common life, or in those deeper questions which perplex the spirits of men from age to age.

-
- ART. III.—1. *Report from Select Committee on the Observance of the Sabbath day; with the Minutes of Evidence and Appendix.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be Printed. August 6, 1832.
2. *The Duty of observing the Christian Sabbath, enforced in a Sermon, preached before the University of Cambridge, &c.* By SAMUEL LEE, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University, &c. Second Edition. London, 1834.
3. *The Pearl of Days.* By A LABOURER'S DAUGHTER. London, 1848.
4. *The Hendersonian Testimony.* Edinburgh, 1849.
5. *Memoirs of Sir Andrew Agnew of Lochnaw, Bart.* By THOMAS M'CRIE, D.D. Second Edition. Edinburgh, 1852.
6. *Statistics and Facts in Reference to the Lord's Day.* By the Rev. JOHN BAYLER, B.A., Clerical Secretary to the Society for Promoting the due Observance of the Lord's Day. London, 1852.

WHEN things are considered from the outside, the number Two is certainly the most apparent cypher of the world; and that owing to the very nature of existence. All things go flocking in pairs before hoary Proteus, that time-honoured shepherd of the Dorian mythology, who continually drove his countless creatures over the fields of space, and was the symbol of the heaven-descended energy, or soul, of the visible universe. Every positive has its negative, every part its counterpart, every right its left, every surface its substance, every position its opposite, every yes its no. Each child of the Mighty Mother is united in marriage with another, and the two are one; but each is nothing without the other, or rather (not to state the point too curiously at present) each is quite another thing without the other. Sun and planet, earth and moon, night and day, cold and heat, plant and animal, animal and man, man and woman, soul and body, are so many instances of this duality. Yet the contemplation of these relations is unsatisfactory, so long as this external point of view is insisted on. There must be some deeper law, underlying all this apparent duality: and so, indeed, there is; but it cannot be seen without looking at things from the inside, that is to say, not from the sensation of them (nor yet the judgment according to sense concerning them) but from the Idea;—for this is one of those weightier matters which yield their secret only to the eye of spiritual discernment.

Beheld from the ideal point of view, then, night is not night without day, nor day without night. The thought of night implies that of day. Be it supposed that the earth did not turn on its axis, yet going round the sun once a year, so that one hemisphere should bask in continual light, and the other lie in boundless shade. The imaginable Adam of the darkling side could never have called the unchanging state of his dreary gardens by the name of night; nor the restless denizen of the unshadowed and excessive paradise have ever known that the sun was the Lord of Day. It is impossible to pronounce the conception of Day, in the mind, without speaking that of Night at the same time, and also without (likewise in the same moment of thought) the intellectual sense of the likeness in unlikeness of Day and Night. Think Day, and you also think both Night and the Relation between Day and Night. In truth, then, the idea (call it that of Day, or that of Night) is threefold, not twofold:—Day, Night, and their Relation. Day is the thesis, Night the antithesis, their Relation the mesothesis of the triad,—for triad it is, and not a mere pair or duad, after

all. It is the same with all the other couples cited above, and with all couples, for every idea is a trinitarian. Positive pole, negative one, and that middle term wherein they are made one; sun, planet, their relation; solar atom, planetary one, their conjunction; and so forth. The term of relation, betwixt the opposites in these ideal pairs, is sometimes called the Point of Indifference, the mesoteric Point, the Mid-point. This mid-point is to be seen standing betwixt its right and left fellow-elements in every dictionary: for example, Men, Man, Women; or adjectively, male, human, female. 'So God created man in his own image: in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.'

Now this threefold constitution of ideas is universal. As all things seem to go in pairs to sense, and to the understanding, so all are seen in threes by reason. This law of antinomy is no limited, no planetary law, nor yet peculiarly human; it is cosmical, all-embracing, ideal, divine. Not only is it impossible for man to think Beauty without simultaneously thinking Deformity and their Point of Indifference, Justice without Injustice and theirs, Unity without Multiplicity and theirs; but those several theses (Beauty, Justice, Unity, namely) cannot be thought without these their antitheses, and without the respective middle terms of the pairs. As the eye of common-sense cannot have an inside without an outside, nor a solar orb without a planetary orbicle (inasmuch as it ceases to be solar the instant it is stript of its planet), so the eye of reason cannot see an inside without seeing an outside and also their connexion as the inside and the outside of one and the same thing, nor a sun without his planet and their synthesis in a solar system. In short, three-in-one is the law of all thought and of all things. Nothing has been created, nothing can be thought, except upon the principle of three-in-one. Three-in-one is the deepest-lying cypher of the universe.

It were irrelevant in the present connexion to enlarge on the significance of the number Five, or rather of Five-in-one,—for such is the true formula of all those Pythagorean figures, which have so pleased and tantalized the mind of man in every age. It was on the fifth day of creation that the animal kingdom proper made its appearance:—but, of course, Man is never to be included in that kingdom, seeing he is an animal and something more, that something more being his greater part. It were as philosophical, in fact, to class an animal with the vegetable world, merely because it is a plant and something more, as to call man

an animal. He is in the kingdom, but not of it: he has a sphere all to himself, constituting and belonging to the fifth kingdom of terrestrial nature. Precisely as a mineral is a congeries of atoms and something more, as a plant is a mineral and something more, and as an animal is a vegetable and something more, is man (be it repeated aloud) an animal and something far more—the space between him and the highest of the brutes being immeasurably greater than what separates the ox from his pasture, or the heather from the rock to which it clings. It was therefore on the Fifth day that the animal world was made manifest in the beginning, according to the Scripture. Now, there are five kinds of sensible form, five structures or tissues, in the general anatomy of the animal nature: there is the amorphous, exemplified by the earthy nature of the bones and the fatty matters of the cellular substance; there is the globular, shown in the blood, ‘which is the life;’ the cellular, particularly seen in the skinny parts, but shed through the whole frame, covering, protecting, and supporting; the fibrous, the specific tissue of the muscular system, and entering into all tubular structures; and, fifthly, there is the cerebral, the proper matter of the brain and nerves, which no man can yet describe or qualify. There are likewise five organic systems in the more exalted ‘moving creature that hath life;’ the stomach and its assistant chyle-elaborating organs; the quickening and circulating system, namely, the heart, the lungs, and the vessels; the muscular and bony, or the locomotive apparatus; the reproductive one; and, fifthly, the nervous system,—‘the be-all and the end all here.’ Then the higher animal trunk (even such as occurs in the cetaceous sea-brutes, or great whales of the fifth day), itself containing five well-marked compartments, sends out five limbs, two hind-legs, two fore-legs or arms or wings, and one neck:—for the innocent reader must understand that these new anatomists consider the animal head as nothing more than the last vertebra, or end-bone of the neck, developed to extravagance, as if it had been made of obstinate glass (like that in the well-known tale) and slowly expanded by some patient blowpipe: and as for the tail, it is just the other end of the neck, and it can be done without, witness Man himself. Indeed Man himself is the most perfect type, by way of inclusion always, of the animal form; just as a lion is really a more finished plant than any rooted palm in his jungle. It is therefore not out of place to take notice of his five senses, the five parts of which each of his legs and arms is composed, the five fin-

gers of his hand, the five toes of his foot, and the five teeth in each of his four infantile jaws (those legs and arms of the face, the nose being the facial fifth or neck), not to mention any more of these fantastical, but obtrusive and innumerable fives. In short, the prevalence of this number Five in the animal domain has impressed the more recent mind of Europe with its image, just as it seized the imagination of the men of old; and an eminent continental naturalist founds his classification on the fact, taking Five as the cypher of animated nature.

To carry these cursory remarks about this number, and the fifth note of the weekly octave, a little farther (by way of curiosity, if not for much edification) it should be mentioned that an interesting and important proposition has been advanced and argued by Dr. Samuel Lee, the learned and authoritative Hebraist of Cambridge, which will be found to affect the present question in a touching manner.* That proposition is to the three-fold effect; first, that the primitive Sabbaths of those patriarchal epochs, which went before the Exodus of the arising Hebrew people from Egypt, was in reality put back a day by Moses after and in commemoration of that outcoming; secondly, that this was intended to be a temporary and purely Jewish change, or a mere deciduous graft, foreordained to fall off when the fullness of the time should come for making the whole world kin by and in Jesus Christ; and, thirdly, that the Sunday of Christendom is actually the Sabbath-day of Abraham. The professor pleads for this view with much erudition, and with a great show of reason; and he cites names no less redoubtable than Capellus, Ussher, and Gale in favour of the point, in whose researches the same result had come out. Now there is certainly no doubt, but that the all-conceiving editorial We are competent to the criticism of any and everything under the sun; but I, the present organ of that singular Plurality, know nothing of the Hebrew tongue and antiquities, and therefore refrain from venturing an opinion on the truth of this most ingenious and fruitful speculation.† But suppose it to be proved (and the extra judicial mind will perhaps find it difficult to resist) then it follows that the Saviour arose, not on the first day of any but the Jewish, temporary, and pur-

* See the Sermon named in the heading of this article.

† Having thus eliminated the *Ego* from the *Nos*, the distinction shall occasionally be kept in view during the progress of the present discussion, in order to save Our Majesty from the consequences of any opinion which may be deemed too personal and limited.

posely misdated week, but on the old, new, and sempiternal Sabbath of the world, as our divine observes.

To come down from those more solemn altitudes, and take up the numerical thread again: It might be charming, especially to such as are never afraid to inquire too curiously, to find out why Five follows Three with so much pertinacity everywhere; why it lays hold on us every time we shake hands; why it answers our eye from so many high places; what its ideal significance is; what it means;—in one word, what its rational ground can be; but *Terminus* forbids. It was both desirable and in keeping to bring out the secret of the tri-unity of all things and all thoughts, at the beginning of this criticism, and that because of its symbolical relation to the Divine Trinity; but these notes and queries about the natural and ideal Pentad or quincunx (to steal an illustration from the landscape-gardener) are intended partly to deepen the sense of numerical periodicity in the affairs of the constitution of man, and partly to serve as a bridge from the cosmical Triad to that peculiarly human cypher, number Seven, which is the proper object of Christian and civilized solicitude in this the nineteenth century.

According to the popular thought, finding its voice in poetry, the life of Man has seven ages. It is certain that his average æon, or proper period, is now threescore years and ten, being ten times seven years; and the climacteric periods of his length of days in any case, according to broad and general observation, are so many multiples of the same number. In the language of science, though not that of the nursery, the time of infancy lasts seven years. Then the first teeth have come laboriously out, during the six years; and had their little day of rest, in the seventh. Then the volume of the brain (not the head) is completed; at least, by the consent of the overwhelming majority of physiologists: and the fact, as it stands, has been heaved as a conclusive battering-ram against phrenology, by no less great a philosopher than Sir William Hamilton. Yet the proposition appears to be true only in a manner; and that a manner not incompatible with some actual or possible physiognomy of the head, which phrenology is or may well become. From the measurements of a more experienced and accurate craniometer than any predecessor, Mr. Straton, it comes out that, while the general figure and bulk of the brain is finished within the first seven years of life, yet, in a large proportion of men, the thing swells and fills up in a measurable enough degree, and in

the few it actually grows and alters its shape, till the end of the forty-ninth annual revolution, a period of seven sevens, and the real completion of a man.* It is not only allowed, however, but strongly affirmed by this observer, that the expansion taking place (even in a Napoleon or, let it be supposed, a Shakspeare or a Newton) betwixt seven and forty-nine is small, in comparison with not only the growth from zero to seven, but even with what occurs between one end and the other of any of the first seven years. To continue;—the boy or girl ceases, and the man or woman begins to appear, upon the close of the fourteenth or second seventh year. Adolescence is done by the end of twenty-one, the third seventh; manhood and womanhood are brought to perfection (as such) by the twenty-eighth or fourth seventh year; and so forth:—but it is always to be understood that these periods and figures are deduced from a generalization taken, not only from all climates, but also from both sexes; for if woman is earlier, man is later, and the balance must be struck between them for undivided humanity. If the hand is analyzed, you have seven pieces,—five fingers, metacarpus, and carpus; the foot,—five toes, tarsus, and metatarsus: and when the arm is examined more curiously, than in that first glance which divides it into five, it yields you seven parts,—the shoulder blade and collar-bone (composing the shoulder), the humerus, the ulna or ell-long bone of the forearm, the fibula or brooch-pin bone of the same (and the reason these are counted two is obvious,—the latter is planetary to the former, it revolves round it, it has a purpose of its own, it and its muscular system turn the wrist on the ell-bone, which alone is the true forearm), the carpal system or wrist, the metacarpal or palm, and, seventhly, the digital one or bunch of fingers. In short, just as the first look at man divides him into threes, and the second into fives, he falls into sevens at the third analysis; and pages might be filled with its results, but it is better to refrain from anatomical detail. It has to be observed, however, that the pious mediæval transcendentalists were so pungently impressed by the sevensomeness of the microcosm, as they denominated man, that, having descried seven planets, they thought there could not possibly be any more, and therefore they made no more discoveries in that direction. They did the very same by their seven poor metals: and they associated these bright bodies, both in name and in the idea of mystical correspondence, with the days of the week and the

* *Researches in Cerebral Development, &c.* By James Straton. London, 1851.

planets, gold with Sunday and the Sun (for Sol was dethroned in the days of the Ptolemaic Astronomy, and degraded to the planetary estate), silver with Monday and the moon; and so forth throughout the triple series. One can only say that the new Astronomy and Chemistry have exploded all this cunningly devised superstructure; but the number of the planets is not yet determined, far less that of the metals, and therefore there is no saying what multiples of seven may come out in the long run. It is just possible, then, that the antique planetary and metallic Seven may turn out to be something more than fantastical jargon:—although it is certainly impossible not to laugh at the conceit of one of the latest ornaments of those old schools, who argued, against the earlier Copernicans, that it is beyond Omnipotence there should be more than seven planets, because there are only seven metals, and only seven holes in the head—two eyes, two ears, two nostrils, and one mouth!

The majority of our readers, and all our critics (since even critics and critics' critics have critics, like the dogs' man's man's man of my Lord Harkaway's kennel,) will think this all moonshine; yet your positive, sceptical, and contemptuous Modern Science is not, dares not, and cannot be ashamed of Seven; for moonshine itself is a web of seven-twined thread, and the moon (that Penelope, who weaves the evervanishing fabric) goes on her way, and does all her stints of work, to the music of the same homely Number, whereby the very sea, 'and the dead that are in it,' are rocked in their great cradle to the selfsame tune. No sooner is a pencil of light made to pass through a prism, than it blabs its secret, and shows itself seven-twined and beautiful. It is to no purpose that the more refining optician avers, that there are only three primary colours. Possibly, nay certainly, there are; but there are seven colours of the rainbow, for all that. It is here, as elsewhere, in fact: for the first analysis gives three, the second five, and the third seven; the first, third, and fifth constituting the natural chord of this painted scale. Ever since God did set his bow in the cloud, that rested on the mountains of Ararat, over against Noah and his household, on the occasion of that first family-worship after the flood, the children of Light have been saying, 'We too are Seven, with speechful look, if not with still small voice. But if the eye is silent, the ear is not deaf to the seven-toned rhythm of the universe, nor the mouth dumb to give it echo, nor yet the fingers without skill to fetch its antitype out of reeds and pipes and strings. Music, that catholic and published tongue, that speech of cherubin

and seraphin, that poetry taken wing, that science passed into ecstasy, that transfiguration of the common state of man (whether in the body, or out of the body, one cannot tell) is also a system of sevens. Enough, in short, might be advanced to shew that anatomy, physiology, optics, astronomy, and the science of music (which are surely not superstitious, nor mystical, nor transcendental, nor credulous of ancient authority) are all familiar with 'the peculiarly human number Seven,' as we have ventured to define it;—and that not only because the body of man (that organization and summary of the known powers of nature) is figured all over, without and within, with Seven, but also because his thought has (sometimes instinctively, sometimes rationally, sometimes in superstition) embraced and sanctified it in all ages and lands, and likewise because it is the astronomical ratio of the sub-system to which his world belongs, namely, that of the earth-and-moon. It is a number which his spirit knows, which his soul loves, which his body like an illuminated missal shews forth: and it is the very number of his house in the heavens:—an irresistible fact, which carries the mind right into the heart of the proper topic of the various, but not unproportioned dissertation.

It is certain that the division of man's time into octaves, that is, into weeks of seven days each (the octave of one, being the first of the next week) is co-extensive with history and tradition, and also co-extensive with the world, except in those places where feeble races have gone prematurely down into dotage; and such division has always been associated with the more or less serious consecration of one day, in the seven, as peculiar and supreme. Secular historians have never been slow to admit the fact; the fathers of the Church were forward to proclaim it; and modern divines have not neglected to keep it forward. The day distinguished as festival, holiday, or high day of some sort, has invariably been that of the Sun, the symbol of the creative energy of the invisible Godhead; or at least the same day, with a corresponding name and significance. In truth, Dupuis, in his famous *Origine de tous les Cultes* (which presents an infamously shallow theory of human worship, however) insisted that the system of chronology, the mythologies of Egypt, India, old Greece, and even the mythology (as he considered it) of Christendom, have all sprung out of an elaborate scheme of Sun-worship and its Sundays: and the book is so full of curious and important things, that the student of these matters might well study it with advantage, appropriate its treasures, and then

laugh at its presumption in trying to explain a deeper phenomenon by means of one lying nearer the surface,—as if a great brass handle could unlock the gates of St. Paul's in London city without a key! When the seven-some analysis of time began, history cannot tell, inductive science cannot find out, and no conjectural Dupuis or Volney of them all can divine. Not only as a writer in a Christian Review; nor yet as one who makes bold to 'claim the honorable style of a Christian,' after the manner of Sir Thomas Brown in the preamble to his account of the Religion of a Physician; but also as the humblest of the disciples of an older philosophy, drawn from profounder sources, than that of Helvetius and the Encyclopedia, I have not a doubt upon the point. I believe that Man knew this, and many a far deeper secret, in Paradise, during the true prehistoric epoch of human story;* and that after the fall from the intuitive and holy life of Eden, these things could not be forgotten in a day. Such is the idea set forth in the opening of the Book of Genesis; and, since it is impossible to argue so great a proposition within these limits, it is better just to alight at once on the plain fact, be its interpretation what it may, that the oldest written record in the world not only claims a prehistoric and all-conceiving epoch or angelic infancy for the life of humanity, but at once announces the measure of earthly time by Seven, and that from the divine side of the thing. Before going a step farther then, let us look into this miraculous account of the creation. It is a strange story, and every well-bred child in Christendom knows it by heart; but few bearded men can agree about it, although no one is willing to give it up, it is so strange and true.

IN THE BEGINNING (how high and awful an archway into the scene!)—IN THE BEGINNING God (not found out by arguments of design, nor deduced from first principles, but known without a doubt, as the father is known of his children) CREATED THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH. In the beginning (wherein was the Word) the city of God had been founded; the solar system and our world had been set in motion: but 'the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep,' which covered it around. But 'the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters' once more: and then began that preparation of the world for the inhabitation of man, which is commonly called the Creation; but, in reality, the earth had

been made unknown æons before, even 'in the beginning.'

I. For unknown æons the sun had been standing in the midst of his planets and their satellites, but no ray of light had yet reached the face of our deep, either because the sun had not yet grown luminous, or more likely because the vaporous darkness, that brooded over our waters, was still too thick. But at last it came, though not in sudden and full enough blaze to show the figures of either sun or moon; and a sunless grey morning arose upon the earth, to be followed by a moonless evening: for 'God divided the light from the darkness:' and 'the morning and the evening,' namely, the day and the night, 'were the first day:' the day of the coming of light, therefore of necessity the first; the day of the first glad tidings of the sun; the Sunday of the awakening week of time.

II. Under the impulse of this new-come accession of muffled solar radiance, the waters divided: part arose, namely, the horrid mist, and fashioned itself into a spherul and unbroken cloud; part remained below, as it was, namely, the liquid element; and the atmospheric or skyey firmament stood between them. The day and night of this world-wide sublimation 'were the second day.' One might well conjecture that the air was so far cleared in the course of the day-time of this day, that even the reflected light of the moon might penetrate, though still too faintly to reveal her form: and in that not impossible case, it has been appropriately invested with the name of Monday.

III. The next process was the standing out of the dry land or earth, and the gathering of the water into seas: followed by the springing of 'tender grass,' or those seedless plants called acotyledons; of 'the herb yielding seed,' or the monocotyledons; and of 'the fruit-tree yielding fruit after his kind, whose seed is in itself upon the earth,' the crowning class or dicotyledons, capable of propagation by grafts and cuts, their seed being in themselves upon the earth. This was the third epoch: that of the coming forth of continents and islands, and their getting covered with the three kinds of plant, in their right order of succession; first, with stony lichens, muddy funguses, tender mosses, ferns, and the like; then, with reeds, grasses, palms, and all manner of herbs yielding seed, but whose seed is not in themselves; and, thirdly, with the completed vegetable, whose British type is the oak with its acorns. This is the Tuesday of our week: the day of the manifestation of vegetable organization and irritability, call it Life who will; sacred in that Scandinavian

* Truly prehistoric, because not progressive, being full. History wants struggle, development, rise, advancement, as its objects. A narrative of innocent days among the perfect is not History.

form of the old Pagan mythology, which cannot but be dear to the imagination of men who use the English tongue, to Tyr or Tiesco, the god of battle or conflict, the divine symbol of effort yet in process.

IV. While vegetation ran riot over the dripping earth (and that under a leaden sky, still unbroken by a streak of blue, or even traversed by a blood-red beamless orb) nature could not unfold her ulterior resources: but that vast exuberance of every kind of plant swiftly appropriated and solidified enormous volumes of the atmospheric moisture: and it is just possible that they also sucked in and assimilated opaque vapours or gases now not known; so as to clear the way for the true arising of the sun on the morning of the fourth day, to be duly followed on the evening by the apparition of the moon and stars: the irradiations of the solar heat, as well as other obvious powers, having meanwhile been working towards the same magnificent result. Such was the splendid work of the palæontological Wednesday; now symbolized and known to us as the day of Woden, the Valorous Person of the multipersonal godhead of our Norse forefathers, corresponding with the Hercules of the Egyptian-Greek theosophy. Hercules, going through his twelve labours, was the sun, going through the signs of the Zodiac; so that our familiar name is a good one for this the day of the sun, moon, and stars.

V. The Thursday or fifth of this marvellous octave was made memorable by a new and strange display of creative power, more than worthy of our ancestral conception of Thor the Thunderer, or god of sheer might. It was then that animal life began to appear. The waters brought forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life or soul, and that up to the level of the great whales of those pre-adamic seas; while every winged fowl, also, was let fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven. The cetacea or water-mammals (quadrumphed, lunged, red-blooded, viviparous, breasted creatures) were the highest manifestations of this amazing period; and they belong to the noblest class of all, even that in which the animal body of Man himself is included. It is a touching thing, in the Mosaic narrative, that God is not represented as having even 'seen that it was good,' when he had said, 'Let there be light, and there was light;' nor yet on the consummation of the purely separative work of second causes, which occurred during the second day: but when the Earth burst into unrestrainable vegetation, during the progress of the Tuesday or third age, 'God saw that it was good;' and likewise, when

the Sun had flashed for the first time upon the forest-green and ocean-blue of the world, and the moon had echoed the Memnon-tone of his ray in the evening, and the stars had joined the chorus at night, again 'God saw that it was good.' But now living things sported in the waters and in the open firmament; happy creatures, akin to Man, and therefore nearer to the Creator himself: and so, it is written in the Scripture for us to read, 'God blessed them.'

VI. Next came the grand day of work. In the morning, the animal kingdom was carried to completion; the unapparent Maker seeing it to be good. But all those fish of the sea, and fowl of the air, and cattle upon the dry ground, and even all the creeping things that creep upon the earth, were unfinished till the coming of a greater than they. No order of things is complete till it have passed into union with a higher, any more than the seventh sound of an octave is complete till the eighth or first of a higher scale have struck. The atomic order is incomplete until embodied in the mineral, the mineral till taken up into the vegetable, the vegetable till lifted into the animal; and therefore all those goodly figures that rested in the coverts, and leaped upon the plains and mountain-sides of the foreworld, were but an uncrowned rabble (not even definable as the animal kingdom) until their nature should have passed into incorporation and unity with a nobler, that is to say, until the coming of their Lord. 'So God created man in his own image; in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. And God blessed them: and God said unto them, Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth, and subdue it; And God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good. And the evening and the morning were the sixth day.' It is almost frivolous, after so sublime a quotation as this, to remark that the prime feature of the day, in so far as man and woman are concerned, is the divine command to be fruitful, or the extension of the law of animal propagation to man, notwithstanding that he is infinitely more than an animal (precisely as an animal is much more than a plant), having been made in the image of God. It is doubtless on that account that the day of our week, corresponding with this creative sixth, is dedicated to Frigga or Freya, the Scandinavian Venus, or goddess of love and generation. Be that as it may, certainly every Friday of the year, but Good Friday above all, must be dear to the Christian who is not overmuch afraid of the formalism of days and years, when he bethinks himself of

the Crucifixion of his God manifest in Flesh, and of the mother who stood near the cross:—

'Stabat mater dolorosa
Juxta crucem lachrymosa,
Dum pendebat filius.'

VII. On the seventh day God ended his work which he had made: not that the almighty will ever ceases from working, since the sustaining of the universe is a standing and perpetual miracle; but that this particular series of operations, namely, what geologists call the palæontology of the world, or the preparation of its surface for the appearing of Man in the image of God, was done. That which the penman of this wondrous scroll set himself to describe was finished. The house was thoroughly furnished unto every good and perfect work, the man and his mate had come, and it now behoved their life to begin. 'And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it; because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made.' How daring a poetic license, yet what a touch of nature, to speak of our never-weary God resting, when the morning of the seventh terrestrial æon had arisen on the darling, for whom his Fatherhood had been creating and making during the six week-days of the world! What a sweet and altogether human, yet godlike thought to bless the day as though it were a living thing,—for no blessing was pronounced by the Word upon the dayspring from on high, nor on the dividing waters, nor on the seas and the earth with its leafy cover, nor yet on the sun and moon, but only upon the animal kingdom and its King! 'And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.'

Such is the genesis of the present order of things in the world: told from the divine side of the phenomenon; for it was the manner of patriarchal thought, not to look into nature for the godhead, but to behold both nature and man in God. Such was the Mosaic Cosmogony, or Moses' express idea of how this planet was got in readiness, and brought to the condition in which it now continues for a time. Next to its surpassing beauty is its philosophical accuracy, and next to that is its geological truth, for our especial wonder; its sublimity being a thing apart, and yet arising out of all those particulars of its literary character. Yet it was not written as a poem to delight the world; it was not elaborated as a speculation on the ideal triad; and still less was it raised on the basis of observation among strata and igneous rocks. On the one hand, it was not a logical deduction; on the other, not a

geological, botanical, zoological induction of multitudinous instances. Above all, the day of the victorious observation of nature had not even dawned. Roger and Francis Bacon were yet afar off, the predestined sons of a new dispensation, which was not to begin till that of Moses and the prophets should be ended: Hutton and Werner were in the distance, athwart a long and dreary Middle Age of Christian time: our geologists could not possibly have existed in any other age than this, for the growings of science are according to law, and the preliminary sciences were not ready for the success of their labours till the approach of the current century. Yet the narrative in Genesis, though making many exquisite distinctions, does not violate the ideas of causation, of classification, and of geological series, brought out by the very latest science, in a single instance. That narrative must, therefore, have been written down from the traditions of the unfallen, all-naming state of man or its reminiscences; or else from direct insight, that is, from immediate beholding of the idea and the law; and that is, in either case, from inspiration, mediate or else undiminished by the traditional medium, Adamic or Mosaic.

It must already be evident, from some of the phrases used above, that we follow those new and doubly Protestant divines who confess themselves compelled by the great results of geology, to acknowledge the days of this miraculous writing to be the symbolical representatives of mighty ages; and it therefore appears to us that we are now in the morning of the seventh day, the Sabbath of the Lord, the day of the life of man, but not determined or constituted a day (philosophically speaking) until the sounding of its octave, that is to say, till the arising of an eighth morning, the first of a second week and higher scale of things: wherefore we do and must look for a new heavens and a new earth. These things we hold, without the discomfort of a doubt, but likewise with perfect respect for those who cherish the old opinion. It is not necessary to go with us in this, in order to accompany us with cordiality in our further argument. It is only desirable to admit that it is a questionable point, which faith and science may settle betwixt them some other day: and surely, when one considers the laboriousness and the rigour of geology, the thing deserves the compliment of an honest pause. Let the mere English reader of the Bible also remember that he is reading a translation from an antique, oriental tongue, into a modern, western, and quite unrelated language.

But aside from all this there still remains

a fact of immense importance in favour of our view: and that fact consists in the difference between the spiritual and intellectual attitudes of the writer and intended first readers of Genesis, on one hand, and of us peeping literal quidnuncs, English and Scottish, in the last three centuries of Christianity after a thousand years of Popish corruption. The difference between the psychological attitudes of Moses and the like of Liebig or Murchison, to speak the truth, is almost as great as if the former had stood on his feet like a man, with his eye heavenward, and the latter had learned to stand and run about on his hands, with vast agility and the advantage of finding out a thousand terrestrial secrets, counterbalanced by the costly damage of only remembering, if not forgetting, instead of ever anew beholding things celestial. The patriarchal and prophetic spirit not only saw everything in God, as has already been remarked, the pious modern soul (even Shakespeare himself) rather striving to see God in everything; but its vision, when philosophical, was all for things in the idea, not in the concrete instance, the very reverse being the Protestant English turn of mind. They were imaginative and poetic; we are the lovers of matter-of-fact, and the conquerors of common nature. Their spirit of inquiry took the way towards philosophy; ours has cut itself a road into inductive science. They were born-idealists; we are sensationists born and bred, the seekers and finders of whole treasures of natural fact. Above all, it was their way to be continually putting the idea into some suitable symbol; it is ours to consider everything as the symbol of some idea or law, and to be forever hunting it up. Their whole manner of speech was symbolical and round; ours is literal, and deals in straight lines. Noticing, then, their characteristic, and following the bent of our own, the very first question it becomes us to ask in the present instance is, What is the idea put by that true Seer into this symbol of these seven days, and what was a cosmical day to him? Thus interrogated, Science, the seeker of ideas and the discoverer of laws, answers with modest decision, One of our geological Epochs: adding with astonishment, In other particulars the Scripture is a marvel, for we have found it all out again in our own way!

In conclusion of this short discussion of a long question, it must not be forgotten that those to whom the book of Genesis was and is addressed (exceptions going for nothing in history) could not have understood, and cannot understand, a discourse on geology. A geogenetic era would have been, to the Jews a stumbling block, to the Greeks foolish-

ness; and, in brief, it would have been a senseless sound in all Hebrew and Christian ears, until these present days: nay, to the overwhelming majority even now, and for many long ages to come. The Bible was not written for us otherwise and ridiculously few exceptionals, but for the whole world, bond and free; and even more especially for the poor and otherwise unlettered. And as for the knowing and critical favourites of science, in the mean time, we have endeavoured (though only by a hint) to show them how easily their geology may be taken in, assimilated, and glorified by their faith: and, if the time ever come when sanitary amelioration, social reform, improved policy, ecclesiastical reformation, theology made free by obedience, secular and religious education, and whatsoever other good spirit is in the world, shall have not only brought out the life of God in the soul of every son of man upon earth, but also made all men familiar with the rich results of science,—why then, the whole world shall easily comprehend how a genetic Day is only the Mosaic symbol for a geognostic Time.

Then it is simply impossible that a nobler or a homelier, (nay, or another!) symbolical expression for the idea intended could have been found or invented. The seven-someness of the luminous or of the musical octave,* for example, is of another species: and, in fact, the only Seven in man's common world of sense, which has to do with time, is that of the division of the lunar month by two, as measured by the waxing and the waning of the moon, and then by two again, giving her quarters. This is the only symbol in the world for the idea: for a symbol must partake of the very nature of what is symbolized, as the etymology of the word plainly bears upon it yet. In truth, it is the characteristic of the greater Scripture symbols that they are the very symbols wanted, and the only symbols to be found. They are not arbitrary, not fanciful, not capricious; they are according to law. Hence the significance of the days of the succeeding weeks of the moon, and the sanctity of the sevenths, to Moses and his people, and to all such as have drunk into their spirit, Jew or Gentile; and, what is far more astonishing, hence their sacredness in the eye of almost every pagan mythology! No wonder, then, that we find so many indications that the Patriarchs, rich with the remainders of the lore of Paradise, ended and rested

* An exposition of the part that Number Seven plays in Music has unfortunately to be suppressed for sheer want of space. The musical reader will be able to supply the want perhaps.

from the work which they had done during the six creating and working days of their week, and blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it,—or set it weekly apart. But it was on Moses that the idea of this symbolical (if not literal) seventh, considered as a day of cessation from creating and making, seized with such divine force as eventually to move the greater part of the whole world to the thought. By him at length the blessed law of the Sabbath was formally announced, cut into stone, and published to the hosts of Israel at the foot of Mount Sinai: and thence it has already spread over Christendom, and all Moslem too; being sure to reach the uttermost parts of the earth in the long run. REMEMBER THE SABBATH-DAY, TO KEEP IT HOLY.

Jesus of Nazareth, that greater than Moses, did not come to destroy the law, but to fulfil it. He never abolished this patriarchal and Mosaic institution. On the contrary, the Church of Christ, though not founded on this rock, has been built, not in a little proportion, with stones fetched from no other quarry. It never appears that the early Jewish Christians (whether at Jerusalem, about the towns and country-sides of Judea, or in foreign parts) forgot the Sabbath-day of their countrymen, while they did not forsake the assembling of themselves together on the Sunday or first day of the succeeding week, as the day of their Lord and Master's arising. The example of fidelity to the old ways, of loyalty to Moses and the prophets, of the tenderest patriotism in unison with charities so wide as to overflow the earth, shewn by Jesus himself, might almost make one sure that they did not. Certainly the tenor of Paul's epistle to the Hebrews, and indeed of all the Pauline writings, was against any such self-assertion and insolence, if not impiety, as so divisive a course would have thrust upon the angry eye of those who did not believe their report:—and assuredly they would not be the worse of a true and whole Day of Rest and Old-Testament reading, followed by ever so partial and broken a day of New-Testament exercises. At the same time, the apostle of the other nations of the world always sternly insisted on the Jewish tests not being forced upon them; and a noble piece of charity and wisdom it was. They were to remain free, not only of all other particulars of the Mosaic ceremonial, but also of the particular day appointed by that authoritative lawgiver as the Seventh;—and the particularity of the day selected, it must be evident, was the only thing that was purely ceremonial in the Fourth Commandment. It was therefore among those foreign converts, first called

Christians at Antioch, that the consecration of the Christian, not Sabaoth or rest, but Sabbath-day arose. Like all the disciples, Jew as well as Gentile, they came together on their Lord's day (not having rested the day before, however, like their Hebrew brethren) but that very day was the Sunday of their heathen neighbours and respective countrymen, and patriotism gladly united with expediency in making it at once their Lord's day and their Sabbath. Wherever Christianity appeared and triumphed and grew strong, accordingly, there the Day of the Sun became transformed, yea, transfigured into the Christian Sabbath-day; and if our Cambridge Hebraist and his divines be right in their computation, that the Sabbath of the patriarchal dispensation was on one and the same day with the wild Solar holiday of all pagan times (the latter having, in reality, descended and degenerated from the former) then the restoration of the heaven-descended resting-day of Paradise, of Enoch, and of Abraham, was as beautiful as it was natural and easy. On the other hand, if this speculation be but a chapel in the air, and if the authority of the Church is to be ignored altogether by protestants, there is no matter; because opportunity and common expediency are surely argument enough for so ceremonial a change as the mere day of the week for the observance of the rest and holy convocation of the Jewish Sabbath. That primitive church, in fact, was shut up to the adoption of the Sunday,—until it became established and supreme, when it was too late to make another alteration: and it was no irreverent nor undelightful thing to adopt it, inasmuch as the first day of the week was their own high-day at any rate; so that their compliance and civility were rewarded by the redoubled sanctity of their quiet festival. Perhaps the patriarchal and Hebrew Sabbath needed this added charm to draw all the manifold nationalities, idiosyncrasies of race, and climatic temperaments of the vast and various heathen-world, to the love and obedience of it: and certainly the time-honoured Sunday of our own forefathers is as good a Sabbath, just as it is as good a Seventh, as any other. Nor is it an easy thing to choose exclusively betwixt the two venerable names—for, while SABBATH is laden with the sweetest ideas of peace and repose and antiquity older than antiquity, SUNDAY is doubly glorious, inasmuch as it speaks of the arising of the Sun of Righteousness as well as of the Sun of Common Light. Both these arisings were the beginnings of new divine epochs; both the openings of, new creations; and they were both veiled, though effective, and hasting duly to be altogether revealed on the

fourth days of Time. The latter was natural and symbolical; the former is spiritual and real: but the imagination marries and makes them one, and the new name of their union is Sunday; as dear to the conquering heart of England, as is its Sabbath-day to Scottish constancy and awe.

Thus, then, we stand before the patent and unavoidable, and really most curious fact, that at least all Christendom has for hundreds of years ended its work on the seventh day, and rested on the seventh day from its work, and blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it! Come it whence and how it may, that is the fact: and, this were the proper place to inquire whether anything can be said concerning the rational ground, on which this institution of an ever-recurring day of rest has been erected, before going into the actual position of the institution, and state of the Sabbath-question, in our own age and country. If this question were to be answered in full, the reasonableness of the Biblical day of rest would be expounded as threefold. Its natural or scientific, its ideal or philosophical, its spiritual or religious reasonableness, in the strongest sense of that term, would be discussed in succession and together; but it would be ridiculous to try the reaping of so broad and thick (and also so white) a harvest within the time of a Quarterly reviewer. As to the last of these heads, indeed, it is better to keep away from it altogether, than not to express one's whole mind in a roomy and leisurely manner; the religious part of the subject having been sorely vexed, almost ever since the Reformation. The Roman Catholics find this element in the authority of the Church; the Grecians and the majority of Protestants, in the authority of Moses in the moral law; and a large minority of Protestants, in the authority of Christian expediency and experience:—not to divide divided Christendom too much at present. For ourselves we cannot but think that the Fourth Commandment as standing in the moral law of an inspired lawgiver like Moses, the lifelong practice of the Church, and that Church's experimental knowledge of the benefits of compliance with the Mosaic idea and of keeping up the old day, make a threefold cord, to gird the week withal, which shall never be easily broken: but we also profess it our opinion, that all the three strands are necessary to its integrity, and that on account of the change from Saturday to Sunday. Such, in brief, is pretty nearly our notion of the Christian-religious reasonableness of this service: and it is obvious that the natural-religious reason of its fitness, from the nature of the case,

must spring out of the stem of philosophy and science, tree and bark, like a fruit;—else it is non-existent altogether. The ideal, philosophical, or truly rational ground of the necessity of every seventh day being given to waking rest, in addition to the nightly sleep of every whole day, has never been opened up and demonstrated: and our own demonstration is too little elaborated, and therefore too long, for insertion here. The topic is merely mentioned in this connexion, partly to stimulate this high kind of investigation by the hint of deep-lying treasures, and partly to sound a note of defiance against all should-be philosophical sneerers at our hebdomadal pause.

The natural or scientific argument (for argument it is, and nothing more) is greatly more accessible; and it has very often been drawn upon, though by no means exhausted at any of its streams. Like the argument of design, and all purely scientific arguments, it goes up from the facts to the conclusion of the case, not down from principles to details. Like those arguments it is cumulative and a thing of increasing probability, not direct, and matter of demonstration. The greater the numerical and qualitative strength of the probability, the nearer to the nature of certainty; until the amount of probability becomes so large as to be tantamount to demonstration. The Copernican astronomy, even as it stands now, is raised on an immeasurable mountainous foundation of mere probability; not on logical demonstration, but only on so huge a sum of probability as is, what Kant denominates, an analogon of demonstration; and therefore we refuse to deal with a person who will not acknowledge it, as being an unreasonable fellow. Such precisely is the kind of service which science may one day be able to render to the cause of the weekly Sabbath, and that in full measure, heaped and running over: yet hitherto this great power has contributed only a few half-hewn and unplaced stones to the work. Unlike the religious and philosophical processes, this of science is a cumulative task, now fairly begun, necessarily slow, always to be going on; and every passing labourer may do his share of it, as he passes:—until some master-builder and his workmen take it all upon themselves, as in other departments. Revelation is like the coming of light; philosophical demonstration at least goes in a straight line; but the path of science, with its observations and inductions, is devious, and very slow: and we have nothing better than a handful of uncut pebbles, fetched from no foreign brook, for our present offering.

I. The multifarious sevensomeness that is so striking in the bodily life of man and in his immediate world, as has been shewn above, should come in here as the van of the argument *a posteriori*; but it is needless to repeat the illustrations. Nor must too much weight be laid upon them. Taken all together, and increased by as many more instances as science may know, they do no more than furnish a broad and reiterated hint, to the effect that the periodicity of seven is deeply natural to the movements of the human being. This pointed indication is only a preliminary business, though a thing that may well mean more than meets the eye; but it has no scientific (that is, intelligible) connexion with the last or first day of the hebdomadal seven being spent in rest. All that science has yet done in this direction is probably summed up in the evidence of physiology and physicians, averring that the powers of the body need repose; that the bow of vitality must be unbent every now and then, if it is to keep its spring; that in these days of overtension during the six days the rest of the seventh has grown indispensable, in addition to the successive nights; and so forth. Now all this is undeniable, and the materialist will perhaps be the foremost to urge it home in his own way; but it is general, and cannot possibly condescend upon the proportion of time necessary or desirable for the kind of Sabbath it inculcates. When coupled with the Christian reason for the weekly rest, indeed, it is of much value; and it has been put before a Parliamentary committee in that connexion.* But when this general opinion of science, regarding the want of a daytime of rest now and then, is ingenuously viewed through the medium of the unailing tendency to periodicity in the Constitution of Man, the presumption is strong that such daytime should recur at regular intervals: and then that particular sevensomeness in human affairs, which has just been animadverted on, puts in its claim for the hebdomadal period as being at least peculiarly human, if not the best for the purpose. At all events, the combination of these three scientific considerations must be held to constitute a powerful moving barrier against all would-be rational encroachments on our sacred institute, not easily resistible when aggressive, and not to be broken down when honourably assailed.

II. It has already been suggested that, when anything has to be said by science concerning man, it is man in the genus or rather kingdom, not in the individual, the

city, the nation, or the race: a broad average must be struck of the ways of man in all times, climes, and other circumstances. This cannot be done to perfection by the limited survey of fallen, and still growing and therefore boy-like, humanity as it now is; but a nearer approximation must be always being aimed at in researches of this sort. It is accordingly impossible to tell with accuracy, by induction, how many of the twenty-four hours should be spent in the state of rest by the normal or ideal man; nor yet how many have been and are passed in rest by the average or actual men of history. We say Rest advisedly, for this period needs not be altogether spent in sleep or the completed trance of animal repose, any more than the waking period ever is passed in absolute wakefulness and erection of the whole being: neither any more, nor any less; and this observation is important in the sequel. But it has here to be observed that the all-pervading law of dualism, which has been explained already, at once insinuates the hint that twelve hours are for work and twelve for rest, say rather, twelve for activity and the same for repose, for, of course, many modes of activity are neither creating nor making. Action and reaction are equal, except when free-will disturbs the balance. It is only in man and by him, that the law of equilibrium is broken. He is the sole sad occasion of either scale ever kicking the beam. Now, that in the present age, with his overlate and over-early hours; his coffees, teas, tobaccos, hops, alcohols, and opiums; his riotous eating of flesh on one side, and living on husks on the other; his frivolities and his toils; his un-resting competitions, of the field, the workshop, the market, the theatre, the college, the forum, the church, the state, and even the drawing-room; his ambitions and fears; his grandiose anxieties and lowlived cares; in one word, that now, with his legion of follies and sins, not unaccompanied by noble though exaggerated aims, man does not (or cannot) allow himself daily rest enough, is what nobody doubts: and it does not appear that the historical world was ever better, either here or anywhere else. Yet there is a natural indolence in him too, whereby he saves one part of himself to overstrain another; and the lazy trick preserves him from headlong ruin: the boxer does not use his brain, the student leaves his muscular system untaxed; and so things are kept as near the straight line as such an awkward squad can keep. Taking this variegated and extravagant creature all in all however, considering eight hours as the average-time he spends in sleep, and allowing him two for

* See especially the fine testimony of Dr. Farre at page 116 of the Report.

his meals and little unbent occasions, the poor fellow gets only ten hours of retributive quiet instead of twelve. In fact, fourteen hours of activity in the twenty-four is on all hands, in parliament and out of it, counted a just average distribution of the daily life of man, at least in Great Britain and Ireland. It is true and sad, indeed, that multitudes do not and cannot secure more than eight of rest; but doubtless there are just as many who take their whole twelve, and unprofitable servants they are: and if not a few of us scarcely make out our six, there are not a few who deftly manage to suck up eighteen, not knowing what to do! But even human legislation, to say nothing of divine lawgiving, bethinks itself of nations, colonies, and planted continents of men and women; and the true average there is only ten hours of repose instead of twelve. Now the defect of two hours a day for six days of labour is exactly made up, to the comprehension of an infant-girl lisping her first Sunday-hymn, by the twelve of a weekly Sabbath daytime. It is, of course, understood that the whole twelve hours of the seventh night time are also sacred to rest; and this is the strong point of those Sabbatharians, who have been pleading with their countrymen, besieging corporations, and praying the legislature, for no canonical holiday, but for an undiminished rest and festival of the soul. In the meantime, however, it is but too clear, take it how one will, that in this overwakeful century, the stimulants and overaction have it all their own way; and hence—what do we see? Men not living half their days; men not reaching their legitimate fulness of development, in body or in being; men too fragmentary, too feverous, too one-sided, too busy and little-minded, excited but not strong, lively but not long-lived; and if men, then nations. Surely the sweet and solemn Sabbath-rest of yore were a true cordial, and the beginning of many subsidiary calmatives, for this chronic and outwearing fever of the world.

III. But is the Sabbath then, it will perhaps be retorted here, to be a day of sheer animal repose? Is it set apart for sluggish quiet? Must great Christendom imitate the frugality of the maid of all work, and spend her weekly holiday in sleep?—By no means. In the first place, excessive as is the activity of some one or more parts of the nature of almost all men during the week, the whole nature of almost none is ever awake an hour on end, from the beginning to the close of life. We are sleepy and conservative, as well as wild and wasteful, though not wisely. What is wanted, then, in a physiologically conceived

sabbath is the going to sleep of the weekday propensities, sentiments, and faculties; and the awaking, rather, of such as are too latent from busy day to day: and hence a natural right of each individual to the choice of his Sabbath occupations and enjoyments, always within proper social or sacred limits. Yet are there two principal things, common to nearly the whole race: firstly, the poor body, in one part of its organism or another, is overworked; and secondly, it is with secular things and forms of thought that men are overbusied during the week. Thence the two plain indications of bodily rest, on one hand, and the conversation of the mind with the higher order of ideas within the reach of man's apprehension, on the other, as the natural avocations of the seventh day of the week. It is change of occupation that is true rest. For the laborious artisan, for example, what a restful alternation to be sweetly attired, to sit at home, to open the family-classic leisurely morning and evening, to sing the immortal songs of King David and the other inspired psalmists with all his neighbours in church or chapel, to send his aspirations to heaven winged by his brethren's prayers, to teach and caress his 'sunday-dressed children, to pray down the blessed Spirit of God into his lowly home, and, this low life almost forgotten, to take the sleep of the beloved in an unwearied bed this one dear night of the week! The student, too, possessed by the one thought of his work day after day, chased by it through his fitful day-sleep, pursued by it all the night, never without its image before him or ready and eager to come forward in a trice, his brain and nerves thrilling all over with it, rules of health given to the winds, many natural movements of the heart bidden away, a rush into society of an evening his one unwilling and rarely pleasing change, were surely a whole world the better of the pause, the altered circumstance, the sociality, the homeliness, the common joys, the blessed associations, the church thoughts and feelings, the pure air, the moony evening peace, the less turbid sleep, the swift low-voiced parenthesis, of his and all men's predestined Sabbath-day. Or could the great minister of state forget his greatness, and his burdens and his dread responsibilities, and his cares almost too heavy for a man to endure and live, commending them heartily to God for a day, as remembering that the beneficent elevation to which he is raised above his fellows does not absolve him from the unescapable necessity, imposed on every man of woman born, of living two lives, an outer and an inner, a lower and a higher (or else, a lower still),—it is never to be doubted

but that the sight and companionship of wife and children, the soft extension of his allowable couch, the quiet unattended meal, the high bible-reading, the serenity and depth of the public service, the canticle sung at home to the music of Handel, and the early hours of a Mosaic day of rest, might well be more than half the battle on the side of God and the Right; and England, with all her lands, would rise up and call him blessed.

Such is the sort of change or rest, not only prescribed by the commandment, and practised during at last two Dispensations in the Church, but deducible from the latest conceptions of physiological science:—not, indeed, that science would by this time have discovered the natural necessity of a seventh day of such rest, and drawn out its formula as a rule of life, but that the thing being almost as old as time, science comes into the world and sees that it is good, and can honestly plead for its conservation and extension. At the same time, we are disposed to go further than some of our Sabbatarian friends in behalf of the first element of the world-old Sabbath, namely, bodily rest, intending that of brain and nerve, as well as that of bone and muscle; and this is the element with which the State has to do, intent upon refreshed and healthy citizens against the day of need. The body has far less to do with the manifestation of humanity than the phrenologist supposes, but far more than anybody else suspects. It is mentioned with lyrical emphasis that, when Israel went forth of Egypt, “there was not one feeble person among their tribes.”* The wild Sunday of the great Pagan nations of antiquity was no Sabbath, and they are gone; the Jews were always disobedient, idolatrous, and Sabbath-breaking, though singularly persistent too, being a living contradiction, and they are scattered; the gay and turbulent Sabbath of Continental Christendom is like the Pagan Sunday than the quiet feast of Christian people, and they are the prey of Despotism, that many-headed vulture. In short and urgent fact, the nations want a genuine day of rest, else they perish: and we Britons need it more now than ever, being the advance-guard of humanity in Europe; and that almost alone now, needing all our self-possession and well-rested strength. The whole physiology of the country craves repose: and that man is no faithful keeper of the Sabbath-day, who expends it in an excess of even bible-studies, passionate communings in the closet, church-services and sermons, prayer-meetings, Sunday-school la-

bours, domestic solitude and unsociality, and untimely vigils. Such a day was never drawn from the Old Testament, and nobody ever pretended to draw it from the New. To listen to the re-reading of the well-known Law, to tell the oft told tale of Egypt and the wilderness, were quieting and easy exercises, alike to priest and people, to parents and children. By all means, let the Sabbath be maintained as ‘a day of holy convocation,’ as it certainly was from the very commencement of the Mosaic era; but let it also be remembered and kept holy as a day of much passivity and real repose, for such was its other, and indeed its primary use from the beginning.

— But we must stop midway in this *a posteriori* or after-hand discussion of the claims of the Christian Sunday on the attention and observance of the world. The adverse reader must understand however, as the friendly one knows full well, that this is not a hundredth part of what has to be said; and the purpose of this article will be abundantly subserved, if it drive the former to the more secret and legitimate study of so national and momentous a subject. Even the little that has been advanced, on the present occasion, has been put forth in a peculiar style, of set purpose: the commoner strain of argument has been avoided, or only alluded to: and there has rather been presented the individual view of a particular mind, living much aloof from others, than anything like the generic plea of ever so catholic a party. It is the humble contribution of a private student to the common cause. Such as it is, it is a distant and unfinished approximation to the adequate expression of one mode of thought concerning this Patriarchal, Mosaic, and right Christian institute of the Sabbath-day:—an institute thoroughly paganized and vilified in the territories of the Greek and Roman Churches already, and grievously imperilled in our own land at last. Last century there arose amongst doubters and unbelievers, this century there has actually arisen among professing Christians and well-wishers, a spirit of indifference and hostility to our most patriotic and politic, as well as world-old and sanctioned Day of Rest. Excitement cannot stop, pleasure cannot be stayed, cupidity will not withhold from gain, public and popular tyranny must and will have unrested slaves, the senses grudge the soul a day. Yet this reverted and fateful current of apathy, frivolity, and dissipation has by no means been suffered to run unstemmed. Truehearted men of every class of our composite society have lifted up their voices, and put forth their hands. Bishops and divines, noblemen and gentlemen, cler-

* Ps. cv. 37.

gymen and scholars, physicians and men of science, preachers and teachers, bookreading and bookwriting artisans and peasants, even humble maids with workaday fingers round their pens, and thousands of dumb, but prayerful dwellers in palaces and in huts 'where poor men lie,' have come forward with their strong protest against the rapid and insidious changing of the old English and Scottish Sabbath into a Pagan Sunday, no better than the Roman Merry-Andrew's holiday of giddy France, or of wicked Austria and her cruel allies in belated Italy. Most prominent by parliamentary position, equal to any in the depth of the principle that quickened him, foremost in persistent constancy, and the favourite butt of popular as of polished scorn, stood and fell in the thick of this unprosperous cause, the late Sir Andrew Agnew, the principled and steadfast member for Wigtonshire, during seven sessions of Parliament. Conceiving that his nature has been much misunderstood, and in order to come a little nearer the actual Sunday-question as it stands in the everyday world of London and Edinburgh, it may be an act of justice to inquire, in these pages, devoted by a *North British Review* to this urgent social and scientific, as well as religious, subject of Sunday in the Nineteenth century, what manner of man the arch-sabbatarian of this century of Sabbath-loving Christianity really was. For a full-sized image of the man, the well-written and hearty biography by M'Crie must be referred to by the more curious student; a work already in its second edition, and too well known and approved for a regular review at this time of day.

The scion of a long-ascending line of baronets, constables, knights, untitled Scottish barons, and Norman soldiers of fortune in England and Ireland, a race remarkable for keeping to the purpose of their heart even in Scotland the land of pertinacity, this obstinate and unflinching Sabbatarian was born at Kingsale in Ireland, just sixty years ago, the only child of a poor young father who died before the birth of this genuine Agnew. From the showing of his congenial biographer, one might well suppose that the old and aboriginal Agneaus must have been so-called (like Kirke's Lambs) on the principle of contraries. Yet combative, aggressive, and self-providing soldiers and constables as it behoved them to be (in order to suit the times we fancy) they seem to have early displayed a religious turn of mind; and that quite compatible spirit could not fail to show itself indomitable, valiant, dogmatic, and ready alike for coercion or martyrdom, in such a

race. Taken all in all, this ancient family of the Agneaus seem to have approved themselves as soldierlike, loyal, steadfast, kindly, and prudent a house as any in the land; at once proud and homely, brave yet wary, pious but by no means suffering their proper goods to be spoiled, more capable of deep conviction than of wide toleration, and much more tenacious than ready to render a reason.

On the other hand the DeCourcys, those old Earls of Ulster, with the head of whom the first authentically recorded Agneau planted himself in Ireland, (whence a descendant eventually crossed in the reign of David II. to Wigton, and acquired Lochnaw, formerly a royal castle,) probably underwent the softening, light-hearted, sprightlier, and less earnest influences of the Green Isle. Be this as it may, it is curious to find these long-parted lineages coming together again near the close of last century, in the marriage of Lieutenant Agnew to the Honourable Martha de Courey, eldest daughter of John twenty-sixth Lord Kingsale, premier baron of Ireland; a loving, sensitive, and most excellent woman, who would assuredly have been frightened out of her wits among the old Scottish Agneaus. Their son Andrew and his sweet mother resided chiefly at Kingsale, under the guardianship of the maternal grandfather, until the death of Sir Stair in 1809, when he was summoned to take possession at Lochnaw. Then he was handed over to Edinburgh, Oxford, Cheltenham, and glorious London for a season. A young baronet, of an uncommonly high and delicate spirit, elegant, accomplished (for that he was—especially in heraldry), and as amiable as his mother, though as staunch as old Sir Stair, this must have been a perilous time for the future friend of the workman:—and certes, that gay youth was actually getting ready to be the workman-like friend of all who toil, us of the horny hand, and us also of the knitted brow! Well-principled, and, what is equally to the purpose, well-natured, he escaped the dangers of youth and fashion. Nay, the steadfast and self-preserving blood of the Agneaus moved easily and at once in his heart to the music of ideas more remote and fascinating than those of prudence and honour. The accents of antique gospel-lore fell on his ear like no foreign tongue. Such glowing oracles as Gerard Noel, M'Crie the historian, and Chalmers had only to speak, that so prepared a spirit might hear and understand the sign: and in an Agnew to understand was to obey, when the subject-matter of intelligence was the saving of one's soul

alive. In short, Sir Andrew solidified with the advance of manhood into an Evangelical Protestant, with a natural preference for episcopacy and the Church of England, derived from habit and early associations, but sturdily Scottish and Presbyterian at the core;—and, in fact, he eventually identified himself heart and hand with what is called the Free Church of Scotland.

In 1830 Sir Andrew was sent to Parliament by the county of Wigton, and after some reluctance he went with the Reform Bill. But another sort of task, and a deeper Reformation was getting in readiness to try his mettle. Parliament was besieged in 1831 with petitions about the Sabbath. The out-of-doors leaders of the movement eventually fixed on him as their parliamentary chief; and a stout and obstinate battle he fought of it, in the house and on the platform, before both open and exclusive meetings, in season and out of it, till he died in the cause. The man became possessed by the idea of our blessed Sabbath; and that to such a pitch of inspiration that, if the age had not been at once averse to repose and incredulous of good, or even (with such fearful odds against him) if he had been as logical, imperious, and eloquent as he was otherwise able and heroic, he must have won the day. Yet this gallant and unyielding soldier of the Law and the Testimony wanted no laurels. It was his rare distinction to be indifferent to popular applause and not afraid of popular obloquy. Here, said he, is the last new ballad just sung under my windows: send it down to the north. When the Zanies were mocking Copernicus on the public stage, he said the same:—let them have their fun: the things I know give no pleasure to the people, and I do not know the things that give them pleasure. For more than twenty years Sir Andrew waged a thankless and unpromising and (sooth to say) a little successful warfare, never fearing the face of clay, nor covetous of admiration and sweet voices, but trusting his convictions, and true to his secret God. We question whether any public character of recent times has done his stroke of work from such a depth of conviction, so unsustained by adventitious circumstances, even Clarkson, and certainly Wilberforce, not excepted. In the last result this is his proper glory—to have been capable of doing without commensurate success and without applause! Yet Sir Andrew had respect unto the recompence of reward: he would scarcely have been a true Agnew if he had not. But he neared the goal before he died. 'It is dangerous,' he said in that great hour, 'to speak of what we have done.' 'The instrument is nothing:

God is all in all.' It is what they all say, the good men and true, in one dialect or in another:—Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us!

Such is a faint image of the great Scottish Sabbatarian. The cause is left with us who remain, now that he has joined the majority at last; but we want a chief. In the meanwhile, this were a proper time and place to review the past procedure of the case in the spirit of searching and inexorable criticism, to see if it were not defeated or deferred by the errors of its friends; and also to discuss the broader and more politic principles on which the standard should be advanced anew. But these practical questions must be deferred till another opportunity. The lawyers have decided that the People's Palace, as it is fondly called by the Proprietors, cannot be opened of a Sunday; and the recent ministerial and Parliamentary changes render it unlikely that a special bill will be soon presented. After all, moreover, the true beginning of a National Reformation were the radical self-reform of the friendly. Above everything, let the professing Sabbatarian, whether Jew or Gentile, whether Popish or Protestant, Evangelical or Formularian, cease from mere opinion and denunciation, and begin to be a Sabbatarian in right earnest. That is to say, let him see that he really work like an honest man during the six days of the week; for no soft and sighing donothing, no minion of ease and pietistic self-enjoyment, no idle busybody whose soul has lost its original sense of the comeliness of industry, is obedient to the First Part of that most noble Fourth Commandment, or can even try to obey the Second. He must then make sure that, supposing him to have been faithful to the primeval pledge of honest labour, he really and truly rest on the Seventh Day, and all his household, nay, and all the world in so far as he is concerned. He must be no party to the overtaking of ministers and teachers, any more than to the mulcting of household or street servants of ever so small a part of their one day of rest, and freedom, and Christianlike self-disposal. In short, he must irremissibly determine that not only himself, but also every other man of woman born however humble (to the extent, that is, that he can help or withhold from hindering) shall actually be a gentleman of the grand old type of the Garden of Eden, at least for fifty-two days, or seven weeks and a half, of the Christian year. What an altered world it were, even in a secular point of view, if such a consummation could only be brought about! Then in very deed might the gentile poor man, a far nobler

being than the poor gentleman of "the ignorant present time," look down without reserve into the welcoming eye of his loftiest brother man, were it a burdened prophet, a laurelled poet, a crowned discoverer, or a king sitting on his serviceable throne.

ART. IV.—1. *The Observations of Sir Richard Hawkins, Knt., in his Voyage into the South Sea, in 1593.* Reprinted from the edition of 1622, and edited by CAPT. C. R. DRINKWATER BETHUNE, R.N., C.B.

2. *Select Letters of Columbus, with Original Documents relating to the Discovery of the New World.* Translated and edited by R. H. MAJOR, Esq., of the British Museum.

3. *The Discoverie of the Empire of Guiana.* By SIR WALTER RALEIGH, Knt. Edited, with copious Explanatory Notes, and a Biographical Memoir, by SIR ROBERT H. SCHOMBURGK, Phil. D., etc.

4. *Sir Francis Drake his Voyage, 1595.* By THOMAS MAYNARDE. Together with the Spanish Account of Drake's attack upon Puerto Rico. Edited from the original MSS., by W. D. COOLEY, Esq.

5. *Narratives of Early Voyages undertaken for the Discovery of a Passage to Cathaia and India, by the North-West, with Selections from the Records of the Worshipful Fellowship of the Merchants of London, trading into the East Indies; and from MSS. in the Library of the British Museum.* Now first published. By THOMAS RUNDALL, Esq.

6. *The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia, expressing the Cosmographie and Commodities of the Country, together with the Manners and Customs of the People; gathered and observed as well by those who first went thither as collected by William Strachey, Gent, the first Secretary of the Colony.* Now first edited from the original MS. in the British Museum. By R. H. MAJOR, Esq., of the British Museum.

7. *Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America, and the Islands adjacent, collected and published by R. Hakluyt, 1582.* Edited, with Notes and an Introduction, by JOHN WINTER JONES, Esq., of the British Museum.

8. *A Collection of Documents on Japan, with a Commentary,* by THOMAS RUNDALL, Esq.

9. *The Discovery and Conquest of Florida, by Don Ferdinando de Soto.* Translated

out of Portuguese by RICHARD HAKLUYT; and edited, with Notes and an Introduction, by W. B. RYE, Esq., of the British Museum.

10. *Notes upon Russia, being a Translation from the earliest account of that Country, entitled Rerum Muscoviticarum Commentarii, by the Baron Sigismund von Herberstein, Ambassador from the Court of Germany to the Grand Prince Vaisley Ivanovich, in the years 1517 and 1526.* 2 vols. Translated and edited, with Notes and an Introduction, by R. H. MAJOR, Esq., of the British Museum.

11. *A True Description of the Voyages to Discover a North-East Passage to Cathay and China, undertaken by the Dutch in the years 1594, 1595, and 1596.* By GERRIT DE VEER. Printed at Amsterdam in 1598. Translated from the Dutch into English, and published by W. PHILIP in the year 1609. Edited and collated with the original Dutch, with Notes and an Introduction, by CHARLES T. BEKE, Ph. D., F.S.A.

Of the many Societies which have been lately formed for the publication or republication of special kinds of literature, there is none, if we except the admirable "Parker Society," which seems to us to be more thoroughly serviceable and free from dilettantism than that of which the already published labours are above enumerated. With one or two exceptions, these volumes are all worth republishing in our day, although few of them contain the elements of that kind and extent of popularity which would recommend them to the notice of a publisher by trade. We are glad so to see the goodly list of subscribers appended to the Society's prospectuses, and we trust that it will be increased in length by the glimpses we propose to give of the contents of the works hitherto issued; for we should regret to hear that the publication of any of the numerous, valuable, and interesting works advertised for early appearance, had been prevented or postponed by insufficient encouragement.

We will not waste space in commenting upon the highly attractive and useful nature of the general subject-matter of these works. Its value and interest are universally appreciated, and there is scarcely any other special class of subject which makes so pressing an appeal to "general readers." It must be said, in praise of our own time, that by no other age has that appeal been more cordially responded to than by it. The world is thoroughly alive to the supreme value of facts, which are fast superseding

the literary reign of fiction, as the principal source of enlightened interest and excitement. We hasten to do what little can be done in a single Article, towards enabling our readers to judge of the capacity of the Hakluyt books to satisfy this wholesome thirst for actual truth in one of its most attractive kinds.

The observations of Sir Richard Hawkins, in his voyage into the South Sea, in the year 1593, was the first book published by the Hakluyt Society. It was chosen rather as a fit book to stand at the head of a list of old travels, than from any great need of a new edition, since that of 1622, of which this is a reprint, is by no means scarce. The editor, Captain Drinkwater Bethune, has added to the text a few good notes, and has, throughout the work, explained all technical and obsolete words, and identified the places mentioned with their modern appellations.

Sir Richard Hawkins opens his "Observations" with a long dissertation on the naming of ships. It appears that his mother-in-law, the Lady Hawkins, craved the naming of the vessel in which he was to sail upon his southern expedition, and having gained her point, christened it the "Repentance." Sir Richard, who describes his ship as "pleasing to the eye, profitable for stowage, good of sayle, and well conditioned," did not relish the prophecy contained in the "uncouth" name. The lady replied to his expostulations that Repentance was the safest ship in which to sail to the haven of Heaven, and would give no further explanation of her choice. It is possible that she may have imagined the ship was to be used in the traffic of slaves; her husband having been the first Englishman who traded in human beings, for which reason he was granted the unenviable addition to his arms of "a demi-moor proper; bound." In this case her gentle heart may have led her to hope that even in her son's life-time, the cruelty of this new traffic would be seen and repented of. Sir Richard finding her inexorable, tried to console himself by remembering that his mother-in-law, though "a religious and most vertuous lady, and of good understanding, was no prophetesse." But he could not dismiss the unlucky name from his mind, and at last sold the ship to his father. Shortly after this "her Queen's Majestie," passing by the "Repentance" to her palace at Greenwich, commanded her bargemen to row round about the new vessel, and after reviewing it from "post to stemme," disliked nothing but its name, which she desired to be forthwith changed to the "Daintie." Under this new name the ship achieved great things in her Majesty's service; but

to its owner, from whose recollection the name chosen by his wife could not be effaced, she ever brought cost, trouble, and care, so that at last he proposed to sell it at a great loss, whereupon his gallant son, who had a love to the ship, and did not fear her under her new name, repurchased her, returning to his father the full money he had received, and a few months after set sail upon his voyage, in which, though there was some cause for repentance, the new name seems upon the whole to have shed its influence. After this history, Sir Richard gives a biographical sketch of several ships of good and bad names. The "Revenge" was a martyr to her unchristian title in no less than eight memorable instances. The "Thunderbolt" had her mast cleft by lightning on the coast of Barbary; upon another occasion her crew was blown up with fire, nobody knew how; and, finally, she, with all her company, was burnt in the river of Bourdeaux. The "Journey of Revenge" was equally unfortunate.

Sir Richard's voyage in the "Daintie," the narrative of which fills the first Hakluyt volume, was upon the whole certainly not one to be repented of, though at the close of it we read of an unsuccessful encounter with the Spaniards. On his return from the South Seas he was most honourably received, and in 1620, was made vice-admiral of Sir Robert Mansel's expedition against the Algerines; shortly after this he died suddenly.

Sir Richard Hawkins' observations have been styled "a book of good counsel." They are indeed full of good sentiments as well as of useful and curious information. In some few instances we are compelled to doubt the accuracy of the latter, as for example, when he warns us in hot climates to shut "scuttle or window" as night approaches, and to avoid sleeping in the open air, lest the planet the most prejudicial to the health of man, namely the moon, should enter, and leave a "furious burning pain, enough to drive one mad," wherever it may chance to shine upon us—or when he warns us against the firing of ships by water that may have had brimstone or other combustible substances in or near it—or where he tells us of a single tree that collected moisture sufficient to supply an island with water; but as these and all similar wonders are founded on the report of others, we must not place the less reliance on such information as Sir Richard collects from personal observations. On one point of experience we must all wish that he had given us more minute information, as in spite of our many new discoveries, we find ourselves far behind him in it:—

"Although our fresh water had fayled us for many dayes before we saw the shore, by reason of our long navigation, without touching any land, and the excessive drinking of the sieke and diseased, which could not be excused, yet with an invention I had in my shippe, I easily drew out of the water of the sea, sufficient quantitie of fresh water to sustaine my people, with little expence of fewell; for with foure billits I stilled a hogshcad of water, and therewith dressed the meat for the sieke and whole. The water so distilled we found to be wholesome and nourishing."

"The Select Letters of Columbus" form one of the most valuable of the Hakluyt books: with the exception of the first, which was translated in 1816, in the *Edinburgh Review*, they appear for the first time in English. In addition to five letters from the hand of Columbus, we find one written by Dr. Chanca, physician to the fleet during the second voyage, and a very valuable document extracted from the will of Diego Mendez, one of the officers under Columbus in his fourth expedition. This last is a narrative of the various adventures in which its author served Columbus, and of some undertaken by himself, in the absence of his superior.

Mr. R. H. Major, of the British Museum, has prefaced this work with an account of all those travellers who are supposed to have preceded Columbus in touching upon American soil; beginning with the Chinese account of a supposed voyage to America in the seventh century, and following every possible claimant of every country till the days of Martin Behaim, who is said by some to have discovered the Azores, and was a contemporary of Columbus. Of the many claims brought forward, the greater number are completely overthrown; but it is of course undeniable that American ground had been trodden by some, prior to Columbus, though by those who knew not where they were, or what great work they had achieved.

The account of Columbus's real and supposed precursors is followed by a summary of his own life, long enough to suffice as an introduction to his letters, to those who are ignorant of his biography, and not long enough to weary such as need only to be reminded of its leading points. Upon glancing at the letters which follow, it seems wonderful that so long a period should have been allowed to elapse before they were presented to the English reader. It is hardly possible to imagine a more interesting document than the first announcement to the Old World of the discoveries of Columbus. On the arrival of his first letter in Spain, it was speedily published and issued from all the principal towns in Europe. In Italy, the letter was even versified

and sung about the streets. In England, Sebastian Cabot tells us there was great talk of the new discovery in all the court of Henry the Seventh, "insomuch that all men with great admiration affirmed it to be a thing more divine than human to sail by the west into the east, where the spices do grow, by a way that was never known before." It was supposed, of course, that India had been reached by making the circuit of the world, whence the name of West Indies was given to the new islands. This memorable letter was addressed to "the noble Lord Raphael Sanchez," treasurer to King Ferdinand and Queen Isabella. After a short introduction, Columbus gives a rapid sketch of his route, naming the several islands upon which he landed, and of which he easily took possession in the names of his sovereigns. These were North Caico, Little Inagua, Great Inagua, Cuba, and others of less note, and lastly Espanola, or St. Domingo. Of these islands he gives a most enticing description, speaking of high flowering trees, throngs of nightingales, and beautiful birds, rich pastures, honey, new and delicious fruits, valuable metals, commodious harbours, and abundance of fresh water. Of the inhabitants he says, "They go always naked as they were born, with the exception of some of the women, who use the covering of a leaf or small bough, or an apron of cotton, which they prepare for that purpose . . . they are timid and full of fear . . . when I have sent one or two of my men to any of the villages to speak with the natives, they have come out in a disorderly troupe, and have fled in such haste at the approach of my men, that fathers have forsaken their children, and the children their fathers. As soon, however, as they see that they are safe, and have laid aside all fear, they are very simple and honest, and exceedingly liberal with all they have, none of them refusing anything he may possess when he is asked for it; but, on the contrary, inviting us to ask them. . . . They exhibit great love for all others in preference to themselves." Such was the first impression made upon Europeans by the race of men who were destined to be exterminated by those they received so gladly. Columbus returned their courtesy in kind, and directed his men to follow his example.

These simple Indians practised no idolatry, but believed that all strength and power and all good things were in heaven, from whence they inferred that Columbus's ships had descended. In this character, therefore, they announced the Spaniards at each new village, whereupon "both men and women,

children and adults, young men and old," when they recovered from the first surprise of such an announcement, would come in crowds to see the celestial beings, "some bringing food, others drink, with astonishing affection and kindness."

Columbus describes Cuba as being larger than Great Britain, and affirms that in a distant province, which he did not visit, the men were born with tails. Of Espanola he says, "it is greater than all Spain, from Catalonia to Fontarabia;" furthermore, he was told by the inhabitants, of an island much larger than St. Domingo, "whose inhabitants had no hair, and which abounded in gold more than any of the rest." After telling of his having left a small garrison upon the Island of Espanola, and giving a few further particulars of the Indians, whose conversion to Christianity Columbus "conceived to be the supreme wish of his most serene King," he thus concludes this memorable letter:—

"I bring with me individuals of this Island (Espanola) as a proof of the truth of what I relate. Finally, to compress into a few words the entire summary of my voyage, and of the advantages derivable therefrom, I promise that, with a little assistance afforded me by our most invincible Sovereigns, I will procure them as much gold as they need; as great a quantity of spices, cotton, and of mastic, (which is only found in Chios,) and as many men for the service of the navy as their Majesties may require. I also promise rhubarb and other sorts of drugs, which I am persuaded that the men whom I have left in the aforesaid fortress have found already, and will continue to find. . . . But

these great and marvellous results are not to be attributed to any merit of mine, but to the holy Christian faith, and to the piety and religion of our Sovereigns; for that which the unaided intellect of man could not compass, the Spirit of God has granted to human exertions, for God is wont to hear the prayers of his servants, even to the performance of apparent impossibilities. Thus it has happened to me

. . . who have accomplished a task to which the powers of mortal men have never hitherto attained; for if there have been any who have hitherto written of these islands, they have done so with doubts and conjectures, and no one has ever asserted that he has seen them, on which account their writings have been looked upon as little else than fables. Therefore let the King and Queen, our princes and their most happy kingdoms, and all the other provinces of Christendom, render thanks to our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, who has granted us so great a victory and prosperity. Let processions be made, and sacred feasts be held, and the temples be adorned with festive boughs. Let Christ rejoice on earth, as He rejoices in heaven, at the prospect of the salvation of so many souls of so many nations hitherto lost. Let us also rejoice, as well on account of the exaltation of our faith, as on account of the increase of

our temporal prosperity, of which not only Spain, but all Christendom will be partakers."

From the whole of Columbus's letters, as well as from this passage, it is evident that the conversion of the Indians was to his mind the most important object of his undertaking; but it was far otherwise with his cotemporaries, who regarded his announcements much in the light that we have considered the recent discoveries in California and Australia. Expeditions of discovery were projected in every country, and the New World was soon scattered with adventurers, each of whom was anxious only to secure a part of the wealth promised by Columbus to his successors.

On Columbus's return he was received in triumph by his countrymen, and treated with great distinction at Court. We can easily imagine the curiosity with which the courtiers questioned him concerning the wonders he had seen, and the deference with which they would treat the man who had doubled the possessions of their Sovereigns; the King and Queen themselves must have had many a long colloquy on the subject of their new lands, and subjects endowed with tails. But the pleasures of the Court did not make Columbus forgetful of his Colony in Espanola, nor of his longing to prosecute new discoveries. In six months he again set sail towards the west.

Of his second voyage we have two accounts: the first by Dr. Chanca, and the second by Columbus himself; from the former we learn that Columbus, anxious to reach Espanola without loss of time, steered his course as nearly as possible in a straight line. On his way he discovered the Islands of Domenica, Marigalante, Guadaloupe, Montserrat, Santa Maria la Antigua, St. Martin, Santa Cruz, and Porto Rico, with a few others.

The Spanish fleet, as it was approaching one of the Caribbee Islands, came in sight of a canoe, in which were four men, two women, and a boy, who, on seeing the ships, "were so stupified with amazement, that for a good hour they remained motionless, at the distance of two gunshots." At the end of the hour they were surprised by a boat containing twenty-five Spaniards, who had been sent round behind them. A contest ensued, in which the women took an active part. On the canoe being upset, the savages remained in the water, swimming, and occasionally wading in the shallows, still using their bows. They were, however, taken by the Spaniards; but not till they had revenged their capture by one mortal wound, and several others less dangerous. From these savages Columbus heard of an Island called

Cayre, whence he might bring as much gold as he liked; but as it was behind him, he did not turn out of his course to prove the truth of the report, but pushed on to Espanola. On landing here, the Spaniards saw a "great lizard as big as a calf, with a tail as long as a lance," after which they proceeded along the coast in search of their countrymen who were settled there. As they approached that part of the island on which they expected to see them, some of the sailors found two dead men, whose bodies bore marks of violence; farther on two more corpses were found, and as these were bearded men, which none of the Indians they had seen were, the Spaniards became much depressed, and feared that some evil had happened to their countrymen. On arriving at the bay near which the Colony had been stationed, Columbus fired a gun, but received no signal in return. Soon after, a party of Indians requested an audience with the Admiral, and, after giving him presents, related that some of the Spaniards had, in his absence, died of a contagious disease, and others had fallen in war, as the province had been invaded by neighbouring kings; but they added that the survivors were quite well, and at a little distance with the King, Guacamari, who himself lay wounded. On the following morning, the Spaniards arrived at the Settlement, and found it burnt to the ground; they then captured some Indians, and learned from them that all the colonists were dead; in other respects their story agreed with the former one. Columbus proceeded to the dwelling of Guacamari and made further inquiries, but could get no new intelligence. There were many circumstances which led him to suspect the honesty of the Indians in this matter, but as he had no means of disproving their assertions, he was compelled to pass it over in silence. Such was the fate of the first American Colony.

Dr. Chanca's letter is too long to allow of our following all the incidents therein related: they are very amusing, but his style of writing is in every way inferior to that of his master, to whose memorial of the same voyage we gladly turn.

It was drawn up for Ferdinand and Isabella, who, it would seem, had experienced some disappointment regarding the quantity of gold and other precious commodities sent from the new islands. Columbus occupies most of this memorial in explaining that he could not have collected more wealth without neglecting the health of his men, and his other duties as Admiral, and giving up also his great object of finding new lands. He seems to have thought it his duty rather to discover and indicate to

others the various sources of wealth possessed by the new Indies, than to occupy himself in collecting riches. He evidently knew that though Spain had thousands of good gold-diggers, and merchants to send out, she had but one Columbus. After excusing himself very satisfactorily on this point, he makes many wise suggestions concerning the management of the new countries. Among these we meet with the first proposal for modern slavery, strangely mixed up with a plan for making Christians of the unfortunate slaves.

"For the good of the souls of the said cannibals, and even of the inhabitants of this island, the thought has suggested itself to us that the greater number that are sent over to Spain the better; and thus good service may result to your Highnesses in the following manner:—Considering what great need we have of cattle, and of beasts of burthen, both for food and to assist the settlers in their work, their Highnesses will be able to authorize a suitable number of caravels to come here every year to bring over the said cattle, &c., in order that the fields may be covered with people and cultivation; these cattle, &c., might be paid with slaves, taken from among the Caribbees, who are a wild people, fit for any work, well proportioned, and very intelligent, and who, when they have got rid of the cruel habits to which they have been accustomed, will be better than any other kind of slaves. When they lose sight of their country they will forget their cruel customs; and it will be easy to obtain plenty of these savages by means of row-boats that we propose to build. . . . Their Highnesses might fix duties on the slaves that may be taken over, upon their arrival in Spain."

The latter part of this memorial is filled with petitions for such of his officers and assistants as merited rewards. Dr. Chanca's name stands foremost in this list. On coming to the end of this memorial every one must be struck with the unselfishness and generosity of the writer, as well as with the vastness of his intellect, which enabled him to see at a glance what centuries of experience have shewn to be the best policy with regard to the rich lands he had found.

The next letter written by Columbus to the King and Queen from Espanola is descriptive of his third voyage, and is far more interesting than either of the foregoing. It is too much condensed to allow of our making an abstract of it, but we will extract two or three passages which cannot fail to interest our readers. The first describes the effect made upon Columbus by the *embouchure* of the vast river Orinoco.

"I found that the island of Trinidad formed

with the land of Gracia a strait of two leagues width from east to west, and as we had to pass through it to go to the north we found some strong currents which crossed the Straits, and which made a great roaring, so that I concluded there must be a reef of sand, or rocks, which would preclude our entrance; and behind this current was another, and another, all making a roaring noise like the sound of breakers against rocks. I anchored there, under the said point Arenal, outside the strait, and found the water rush from east to west, with as much impetuosity as that of the Guadalquivir at its conflux with the sea; and this continued constantly, night and day, so that it appeared to be impossible to move backwards for the currents, or forwards for the shoals. In the dead of night, while I was on the deck, I heard an awful roaring, that came from the south towards the ship; I stopped to observe what it might be, and I observed the sea rolling from west to east like a mountain, as high as the ship, and approaching by little and little; on the top of this rolling sea came a mighty wave, roaring with a frightful noise, and with all this terrific uproar were other conflicting currents, producing, as I have already said, a noise as of breakers against rocks. To this day I have a vivid recollection of the dread I then felt lest the ship might founder under the force of that tremendous sea; but it passed by, and reached the mouth of the before-mentioned passage, where the uproar lasted for a considerable time. On the following day I sent my men to take soundings, and found that in the strait, at the deepest part of the *embouchure*, there were six or seven fathoms of water, and that there were constant contrary currents, one running inwards and the other outwards. It pleased the Lord, however, to give us a favourable wind, and I passed through the middle of the strait; after which I recovered my tranquillity. The men happened at this time to draw up some water from the sea, which, strange to say, proved to be fresh. I remarked, while on one of the watery billows which I have described, that in the channel the water on the inner side of the current was fresh and on the outside salt."

Columbus goes on to argue from this wonderful appearance in the sea, and many other curious natural phenomena, that he had discovered the spot occupied by the terrestrial paradise. He believed that the new hemisphere was shaped like the long end of a pear, and that the garden of Eden was to be found on the apex, whither no man could now ascend. His arguments, which occupy several pages, are very amusing. He says, in conclusion, "And if the water of which I speak does not proceed from the earthly paradise, it appears to be still more marvellous, for I do not believe there is any river in the world so large and deep."

At the conclusion of this letter Columbus again excuses himself for not having sent home more treasures to Spain, in answer, it

would appear, to the assertions of those who were now endeavoring to undermine his interest at Court. After making his excuses, he says,—

"I say all this, not because I doubt the inclination of your Highnesses to pursue the enterprise while you live.—for I rely confidently on the answers your Highnesses once gave me by word of mouth,—nor because I have seen any change in your Highnesses; but from the fear of what I have heard of those of whom I have been speaking; for I know that water dropping on a stone will at length make a hole. Your Highnesses responded to me with that nobleness which all the world knows you possess, and told me to pay no attention to these calumniation; for that your intention was to follow up and support the undertaking, even if nothing were gained by it but sand and stones. Your Highnesses also desired me to be in no way anxious about the expense, for that much greater cost had been employed on much more trifling matters; and that you considered all past and future expense as well laid out; for that your Highnesses believed that our holy faith would be increased, and your royal dignity enhanced, and that they were no friends of the royal estate who spoke ill of the enterprise."

It would have been well for the honor of their names if Ferdinand and Isabella had never wavered from the convictions which they had thus expressed to their great admiral.

The next letter is addressed by Columbus to a lady of the Court. We here find him in disgrace and sorrow. "I have now reached the point," says he, "that no man is so vile but he thinks it his right to insult me; but the day will come when the world will reckon it a virtue in him who has not given his consent to their abuse." It is well known that this statement is no exaggeration; that Columbus was displaced from the government of Espanola, and sent in chains to the country which had so lately received him in triumph. His own account of the insults to which he was subjected by the new governor (Bobadilla, of evil memory) is very touching. He complains bitterly, but does not utter one word of disrespect towards his King, who sent such a man to displace and insult him. Towards the conclusion he says,—

"God is just, and he will in due time make known all that has taken place, and why it has taken place. I am judged in Spain as a governor who had been sent to a province or city under regular government, and where the laws could be executed without fear of endangering the public weal; and in this I receive enormous wrong. I ought to be judged as a captain sent from Spain to the Indies, to conquer a nation numerous and warlike, with customs and religion altogether different to ours; a people who

dwelt in the mountains, without regular habitations for themselves or for us, and where by the Divine will, I have subdued another world to the dominion of the King and Queen, our sovereigns, in consequence of which Spain, that used to be called poor, is now the most wealthy of kingdoms."

This letter is followed by one to the King and Queen. It is of the same character as the last, but, if possible, more noble in style and feeling. A great part of it is occupied by Columbus with the events of his fourth voyage; but these are mixed up with frequent complaints of the insults he had received. In one part he suddenly bursts into reproach, keen, though respectful:—

"Such is my fate, that twenty years of danger through which I have passed with so much toil and danger, have profited me nothing; and at this very day I do not possess a roof in Spain that I can call my own. If I wish to eat or sleep, I have nowhere to go but to the inn or tavern, and most times lack wherewith to pay the bill."

But he soon quits this bitter tone, and fills many pages with lively descriptions of people, places, and events. Among the latter, we find an account of a terrific storm, in which "the sea seemed as a sea of blood, seething like a cauldron on a mighty fire," and when the sky "did never look more fearful," so that during one day and night, while it "burned like a furnace," the awestricken Spaniards looked continually to see that their sails were not destroyed; for "the lightnings flashed with such alarming fury," that all thought the ships must have been consumed. Once again, as he draws to a conclusion, the remembrance of his wrongs forces itself upon him:—

"I was twenty-eight years old when I came into your Highnesses' service, and now I have not a hair upon me that is not grey; my body is infirm, and all that was left to me, as well as to my brothers, has been taken away and sold, even to the frock that I wore, to my great dishonor. I cannot but believe that this was done without your royal permission. The restitution of my honor, the reparation of my losses, and the punishment of those who have inflicted them, will redound to the honour of your royal character. . . . Great and unexampled will be the glory and fame of your Highnesses if you do this; and the memory of your Highnesses, as just and grateful sovereigns, will survive as a bright example to Spain in future ages. The honest devotion which I have always shewn to your Majesties' service, and the so unmerited outrage with which it has been repaid, will not allow my soul to keep silence, however much I may wish it. I implore your Highnesses to forgive my complaints. I am indeed in as ruined a condition as I have related. Hitherto I have

wept for others;—may heaven now have mercy upon me, and may the earth weep for me. With regard to temporal things, I have not even a blanca for an offering, and in spiritual things, I have ceased here, in the Indies, from observing the prescribed forms of religion. Solitary in my trouble, sick, and in daily expectation of death, surrounded by millions of hostile savages full of cruelty, and thus separated from the blessed sacraments of the holy Church, how will my soul be forgotten if it be separated from my body in this foreign land? Weep for me, whoever has charity, truth, or justice!"

After which, with a blessing on his sovereigns, he closes his last letter.

The extract from the will of Diego Mendez, with which this valuable set of documents concludes, is a recapitulation of some of the events in the last mentioned letter of Columbus, with the addition of many others, in some of which Columbus was not immediately concerned: all are highly creditable to the writer. It would seem that the good Mendez rightly judged that the memory of his faithful services to the great Columbus, was a more valuable legacy to his children than his money, the distribution of which occupies a comparatively insignificant place in his will.

The next book on our list is, "The Discovery of the large, rich, and beautiful Empire of Guiana," by Sir Walter Raleigh. To Sir Walter Raleigh belongs the honour of having founded England's colonial empire—that empire which is now planted in all quarters of the globe, comprehending a population of nearly one hundred and twenty-five millions in the East, two millions and a half in the west, and something under a million in Africa and Australia. Had it not been for the valour and enterprise of Raleigh, and others like him, we could never have boasted of this vast dominion, and those who read of his ardour in commencing this great work, will be disposed to handle his character more gently than it has been wont to be treated.

During the first half century which followed the discovery of America, the Spanish settlers were entirely actuated by a thirst for gold: and upon the conquest of Quito and Cusco, and the discovery of large gold mines, the far more enduring sources of wealth to be found in the spices, dye-woods, and other natural productions of the country, were entirely overlooked. It was Sir Walter Raleigh who, after having coasted along the American gulf, first entertained the idea of colonizing the new country with English subjects, who might plant, and reproduce tobacco, spices, fine woods, &c., and to this effect he drew up a proposition, and laid it before the Queen. Her Majesty granted him

permission to "search, find out, and view such remote, heathen, and barbarous lands, countries, and territories as were not actually possessed of any Christian prince, nor inhabited by any Christian people." Upon the strength of this permission, Raleigh and a few companions fitted out vessels at their own charge, and set out on the 7th of April, 1584, with the intention of discovering a suitable spot for an English colony. Having fixed on a healthy place, they sent report thereof to the virgin Queen, who is said to have named the new country Virginia, as a mark of her special favour. The Virginians, however, repudiated this honour, and state that the name was chosen by the colonists as descriptive of their country, which still seemed to retain the virgin purity and plenty of the first creation, while its inhabitants could boast of primitive innocence. This is not the general idea entertained of the native Virginians, of whom we shall have occasion to say more presently.

After spending £40,000 in an attempt to colonize Virginia, Sir Walter was convinced that so great an undertaking could not be carried out by a single individual, and in 1589 he ceded his right of government to a company of merchants, bargaining only for a fifth part of all gold and silver which should be found there. Notwithstanding this negotiation, which rid him formally of all further responsibility, Sir Walter could not forget his protégés. We find that in 1602, Samuel Wace, of Weymouth, a "very sufficient mariner," who had been in Virginia twice before, was employed thither by Sir Walter, to find those people who were left there in 1587, "to whose succour," says Purchas, "he hath sent five several times, at his own charges." With all his care for them, he could not sufficiently assist these unfortunate colonists, who, deserted by their legal protectors, the merchants, were destroyed by the Indians. We learn from Purchas (vol. iv. page 1653) that the celebrated Indian chief Powhattan confessed to Captain Smith that he had been at the massacre of the colony, and shewed to him certain articles which had belonged to the unfortunate Englishmen. It was not till twenty years after this occurrence, that the arrival of the Pilgrim Fathers on the shores of Virginia, gave to it suddenly a settled English population.

It was during the period of disgrace which followed Raleigh's clandestine marriage with Miss Throgmorton, that he conceived his voyage in search of El Dorado. He first sent an old officer to explore the lands in which he hoped to find his prize, and on receiving a favourable report, determined upon going himself to Guiana. It is possible that

Raleigh might still have cherished the idea of planting a colony, but remembering his recent failure, and knowing the tastes of his contemporaries, might have deemed it more prudent to advertise a search for gold, than a scheme for cultivating tobacco, sugar, and spices—believing that the first great step would be gained, when he had succeeded in drawing a large population to the spot. He may, on the other hand, have hoped to conquer a new empire of Incas, and to have returned to England laden with riches that would recover for him his lost position at Court. It is the history of this journey to Guiana which is now reprinted by the Hakluyt Society, from the edition of 1596.

Many of our readers have doubtless been accustomed to regard this work as a tissue of lies. It has been so styled by Hume, and others of less note; but as it seems to us, quite unjustly. There are, it is true, notices of Amazons, of gold rocks in Guiana, and particulars concerning El Dorado itself, that might appear to a careless reader to be pure fictions; but a little consideration will shew us that Sir Walter Raleigh probably wrote only what he saw, or what he believed to be true. And as in the latter case, he gives us his authorities, we are left at liberty to judge for ourselves of their credibility. Some things may now appear to us absurd, but others, such as the gold rocks, will have gained greater probability.

The notion of El Dorado had existed many years. We hear, in 1539, of a prince covered with powdered gold; and, again, of a priest who, before performing his sacrifices covered himself with a grease, and then caused gold powder to be showered on him. There are old stories of huge golden vessels, and even golden palaces. It may easily be imagined how the sudden accession of wealth from America gave a gloss of truth to even the fairy stories of old; and that these stories were exaggerated and repeated till Sir Walter Raleigh, with all his wit, received them as acknowledged truths. We keep his writings, while we lose the atmosphere of belief in golden legends that surrounded and softened them down when they were written. A writer who lived in Raleigh's days says, "Sir Walter Rawley knewe very well, when he attempted his Guyana businesse, who erred in nothing so much (if a free man may speak freely) as in too much confidence in the relations of the countrie; for who knows not the policy and cunning of the fat fryers, which is to stirre up and animate the souldiers and laytie to the search and inquisition of new countries, by devising tales and comments in their cloysters where they live at ease, that when others have taken payne to

bring in the harvest, they may feed upon the best and fattest of the croppe."

The account of the American Amazons is professedly given from the report of others; so that at worst, Raleigh was over credulous in repeating it. He was by no means alone in this credulity; for there seems to have been a strong belief, at the time, in the existence of a female race of warriors. Columbus, as we have seen, tells of women who fought whilst wading in shallows: a very few additions or omissions would have turned his fighting Caribbees into Amazons. We may also mention the missionary Gili, who was told by an Indian of "a race of women living alone." Condamine, who brings forward the testimony of two Spanish governors to the same effect; Count Pagan, who says,—"*Que l'Asie ne se vante plus de ses contes véritables ou fabuleuses des Amazones, l'Amérique ne lui cède point cet avantage. . . . Et que le fleuve de Thermoodon, ne soit plus enflé de la gloire de ces conquérantes, la rivière de Coruris (Cunuriz) est aussi fameuse pour ses belles guerrières.*"

Those who take the trouble to read what was said in Raleigh's time, by the above mentioned and many other authors, will not, it is true, believe in the existence, at that period, of a race of Amazons in America; but they will see that the much belied Sir Walter had good reason for believing in it. With regard to the gold rocks described as existing in Guiana, the Editor of the present edition of Raleigh's book, Sir Robert H. Schomburgk, who, as Her Majesty's Commissioner for surveying the boundaries of Guiana, has ample opportunities of knowing, assures us that there were plausible grounds for Raleigh's belief, though it has since proved that the gold is not plentiful enough to pay for working it. Perhaps the following is the passage in which Raleigh has been really guilty of the greatest exaggeration, but it is still only exaggeration, and not deliberate falsehood:—

"The common soldier shal here fight for gold and pay himselfe in steede of pence, with plates of half a foote brode, whereas he breaketh his bones in other warres for prouant and penury. Those commanders and chieftains, that shoote at honour, and abundance, shal find there more rich and bewtiful cities, more temples adorned with golden images, more sepulchres filled with treasure, than either Cortez found in Mexico, or Pizarro in Peru; and the shining glory of this conquest will eclipse all those farre extended beames of the Spanish nation."

In another place he speaks of a race having their eyes in their shoulders, their mouths in their breasts, and a long train of hair

growing backward between their shoulders; but this he gives merely on the authority of "every child in the provinces of Aromaia and Canuri."

Having endeavoured to shew how far Hume's title of "a tissue of falsehoods" is applicable to this book, we must take our leave of it, heartily recommending it to all those who love amusing matter and charming style, and by way of conclusion giving one extract as a sample of the latter. In describing the wife of a Cassique, Raleigh writes:—

"In all my life, I have seldome seene a better favored woman; she was of good stature, with black eies, fat of body, of an excellent countenance, hir haire almost as long as himselfe, tied up againe in prettie knots. And it seemed she stood not in that aw of hir husband as the rest; for she spake and discourst, and dranke among the gentlemen and captaines, and was very pleasant, knowing hir own comelinesse, and taking greate pride therein."

"Sir Francis Drake his Voyage," is written by Thomas Maynarde, an intimate friend of Drake, whom he accompanied in the unfortunate voyage of which he writes the account. One is a little disappointed, on reading Maynarde's narrative, to find his hero rather more sordid than he is generally imagined to have been: but it is, perhaps, a wholesome disappointment; for we are too apt to clothe our heroes, naval or military, with unalloyed glory.

This history is printed, for the first time, from the original MS. in the British Museum, and it will certainly throw a new light on the character of our much vaunted naval hero. The account of his last days is very affecting. In one place, we are told, Sir Francis and his men "got twenty bars of silver, with some gould, and certaine plate;" but Sir Francis thought it folly to gather the harvest grain by grain, while he believed that by going to Panama, they might thrust their hands into the whole heapes;" but after their return, "being troubled in minde, hee seemed little to regard any consayle that was given him to that purpose, but to hasten thence as fast as he might." After landing in a "sickly port," and losing many of his men, Sir Francis met with contrary winds, and provisions grew scarce. During this time of trouble, Thomas Maynarde writes:

"I questioned with our generall, beinge often private with him, whilst we staid here, to see if hee would reveale to mee any of his purposes; and I demanded of him, why hee so often conjured me, being in England, to stay with him in these partes as long as himselfe, and where

the place was. He answered me with griefe, protesting that hee was as ignorant of the Indies as mysealfe, and that he never thought any place could be so changed, as it were, from a delitious and pleasant arbour into a vast and desarte wilderness; besides the variable-nesse of the wind and weather, so stormie and blusterous as hee never sawe it before. But hee most wondered that since his coming out of England he never sawe sayle worth giving chace unto; yet in the greatness of his minde, hee would, in the end, conclude with these wordes:—"It matters not, man; God hath many things in store for us; and I know many means to do her Majestie good service, and to make us riche; for we must have gold before we see England;" when, goode gentleman, (in my concete) it fared with him as with some carelesse living man who prodigally consumes his time, fondly perswadinge himselfe that the nurse that fedde him in his childhood will likewise nourish him in his old age, and finding the dugged dried and withered, enforced then to behold his folly, tormented in mind, dieth with a starved bodie. Hee had, beside his own adventure, gaged his own reputation greatly, in promising her Majestie to do her honorable service, and to returne her a very profitable adventure; and havinge sufficiently experienced for seven or eight years, how hard it was to recover favour once ill thought of, the mistresse of his fortune now leaving him to yield to a discontented mind. And since our return from Panama, he never carried mirth nor joy in his face. Yet no man that he loved must conjecture that he took thought thereof. But here he began to grow sickly. . . . On the twenty-eighth we came to Portobello. . . . This morning, at seven o'clock, Sir Francis died. The next day, Sir Thomas Baskerville carried him a league off, and buried him in the sea."

Maynarde's narrative is followed by a Spanish account of Drake's attack upon Puerto Rico, also published from a MS. in the British Museum. It is to be regretted that the editor, Mr. Cooley, did not follow Mr. R. H. Major's example, and give a translation for the benefit of the English reader, as, though it is a document of considerable interest, it is, in its present form, quite useless to half the readers of the Hakluyt books.

The narratives of voyages towards the north-west, in search of a passage to Cathay and India, contain some of the noblest examples of courage and fortitude on record. We cannot too much recommend the introduction of this volume into families; children of all ages would gladly read the stirring adventures of those bold mariners who dared, with a noble end in view, to face every danger and sail upon new seas of which only the perils were certainly known. In following them through their privations and dangers the young reader could not fail to imbibe some portion of that spirit which

animated their enterprise and sustained them equally in success and failure. This volume is edited by Mr. Thomas Rundall, who has prefaced it with remarks upon the "claims of Sir Hugh Willoughby to be considered as a discoverer." The sketch given of this unfortunate gentleman is exceedingly interesting, and proves, to such as may have doubted it, that Sir Hugh is worthy of being classed with the phalanx of great men whose names grace the pages of Mr. Rundall's collection. There seems, indeed, little reason to doubt his having discovered Greenland, for Purchas says plainly, in speaking of Sir Hugh Willoughby, that he cast anchor at a certain place to which the following remark is applied, "And this is the land which is now called Greenland, or King James his Land, and is known to the Hollanders by the name of Spitzbergen." Notwithstanding this assertion, (which dates his visit to Greenland before those which are elsewhere spoken of as the first,) subsequent writers have ascribed to the Dutch the honour of this discovery. Mr. Rundall maintains, and, to our mind, proves, that Purchas is correct in giving it to our countryman. Sir Hugh Willoughby's diary was found by some Russian fisherman in a deserted vessel in the haven of Arzina near Keger, in Lapland. It is in this inhospitable spot that, in all probability, Sir Hugh Willoughby, with seventy companions, perished from cold and starvation. The concluding passage of his journal makes this pretty certain: "We sent out three men S.S.W., to search if they could find people, which went three dayes journey, but could find none. After that we sent out three W. four dayes journey, which, in like sort returned without finding any people or any similitude of habitation." In addition to the discovery of Greenland, it seems almost certain that Sir Hugh was the first to reach Russia by the Northern Ocean: in speaking of this enterprise, our great Milton says:—

"The discovery of Russia by the Northern Ocean, made first by any nation that we know, by Englishmen, might have seemed an enterprise almost heroic, if any other end than excessive love of gain or traffic had animated the design."

Sir Hugh Willoughby certainly does not forfeit the claim to being "almost heroic," as he did not in any way share in the sordid motives which prompted the enterprise he conducted. Had he lived to give an account of his discoveries, he would undoubtedly have taken a high rank among the sea worthies; but falling a martyr to the work he boldly sought, his glory has well-

nigh perished with him in the foreign haven of Arzina.

The narratives which fill Mr. Rundall's volume are those of Sebastian Cabot, Sir Martin Frobisher, Master John Davis, Captain George Waymouth, Master John Knight, Master Henry Hudson, Sir Thomas Button, James Hall, Captain Gibbons, Byrot and Baffin, Captain Hawkrigge, Captain Luke Fox, and Captain James. It is difficult among such a number of great names to choose one or more for particular notice; but we have selected one passage for extract, which cannot fail to be acceptable, and must be read as an example of the heroic acts to be met with in the volume before us.

In 1511, a mutiny broke out under Hudson; it was headed by one Greene, a man whom Hudson had loaded with benefits.

"It was in consequence of his (Greene's) decision, and under his superintendence, that the master and his son were exposed in a frail vessel to the tempestuous and ice-encumbered sea. Henry Hudson, the master, John Hudson, his son, and six others of the crew, who were either sick or disabled, were brutally driven from their cabins, and thrust on board the shallop. A seventh, a hale and stout man, followed. He was the carpenter, John King by name. Honestly refusing to participate in the guilt of the majority of the crew, and nobly resolving to share, whatever it might be, the fate of his commander, he left the ship for the shallop, unmoved by the entreaties of his otherwise merciless comrades. The victims were no sooner on board, than the shallop was cut adrift, and the ship went away under full sail. . . . In a short time they lost sight of the shallop, and forever."

"The Historie of Travaile into Virginia Britannia," is printed for the first time, from an original manuscript written by William Strachey, who was secretary to the Virginian colony in its early days. The editor, Mr. Major, has prefaced the "Historie" with a sketch of the misfortunes of the first Virginian settlers. To those who have not read a more detailed account in Robertson's America, or elsewhere, this preface will be found entertaining. Mrs. Major has graced the book with some very good etchings, illustrative of the ancient Virginian customs and costumes.

The history of William Strachey was evidently intended to have been a very voluminous work, as he calls the present portion of it, first and second books of the first decade. Had he lived to an age allowing the completion of his ten decades, we should have had, undoubtedly, a valuable history of Virginia; as it is, we have little more than an accurate description of

the country and its inhabitants as they were on the arrival of Strachey and his party.

Strachey's description of the celebrated chief Powhattan is very amusing: of his person he says:—

"He is supposed to be little lesse than eighty years old, I dare not say how much more; others say he is of a tall stature and cleane lymbes, of a sad aspect, rownd fatt visaged, with graie haire, but plaine and thin, hanging upon his broad shoulders; some few haire upon his chin, and so on his upper lippe: he hath beene a strong and able salvadge, synowye, and of a daring spirit, vigilant, ambitious, subtile to enlarge his dominions."

His wives appear to have been as many as his years; for we are told that he might have "as many women as he will, and hath (as is supposed) more than a hundred." These fair Virginians resided "still in their severall places," and not in one scraglio. Among them were always two favoured damsels who, when Powhattan lay on his bed, sat one at his head and the other at his feet. These same ladies had the honour of sitting at meal times, and upon state occasions, at his right and left hand. Our historian also says that there was some dozen of his wives in, whose company the chief took particular delight, "being for the most parte, very young women," and these went with him from house to house, as he hunted or changed his abode for pleasure.

The latter part of Strachey's book assumes the style of a "historie;" and in this part he bears testimony to the care Sir Walter Raleigh had for his unfortunate colony. After speaking of his ill success, he says:—

"Thus Sir W. Raleigh, wearied with so great an expence, and abused with the unfaithfulness of the employed, after he had sent (as you may see by these five severall tymes) colonies and supplies at his owne charges, and nowe at length both himself and his successors thus betrayed, he was even nowe content to submit the fortune of the poore men's lives, and lief of the holy accion ytsel, into favour and protection of the God of all merey, whose will and pleasure he submitted unto to be fulfilled in all things ells, so in this one particuler."

This, written evidently in a style of approval, by one of the sufferers, and by one who was well acquainted with all the circumstances connected with the colony,—clears Raleigh from the suspicion of having too lightly abandoned those who depended on him for support. Even after the failures alluded to by Strachey, Raleigh made fresh efforts to assist the colony, but, as we have seen, the energy of one man, though that man was Sir Walter Raleigh, and much less

of the mercenary company who succeeded to his responsibilities, was not sufficient to carry out so vast a project.

The "Divers Voyages touching the Discovery of America" were published in 1582, by Richard Hakluyt, whose name has been adopted by the Society the works of which we are reviewing. His collection of voyages would have formed the first volume issued by it, had it not been that Mr. Rich, the late intelligent American publisher, was contemplating publishing it on his own account at the time the Society started.

Richard Hakluyt was a clergyman of good family. He was born in London in 1553, and was educated at the Westminster school. While there he paid a visit to his cousin, Mr. Richard Hakluyt, who seems to have first awakened his taste for cosmography and maritime discovery. He says, describing his visit,

"I found lying open upon his boord certane bookes of cosmographie with an universal mappe : he seeing me somewhat curious in the view thereof began to instruct my ignorance.

From the mappe he brought me to the Bible, and turning to the 107th Psalm, directed me to the 23d and 24th verses, where I read that they which go downe to the sea in ships and by the great waters, they see the Lord and his wonders in the deepe, &c., which words of the prophet, together with my cousin's discourse, (things of high and rare delight to my young nature,) tooke in me so deepe an impression that I constantly resolved, if ever I were preferred to the university, I would by God's assistance, prosecute that knowledge and kind of literature, the doores whereof (after a sort) were so happily opened unto me."

In his after years, Richard Hakluyt fully carried out this resolve, and interested himself by writing and action, in all that concerned "that knowledge and kind of literature." It was to him, in conjunction with the merchants, that Sir Walter Raleigh resigned his patent of discovery. He published several books upon the subject of the then recent discoveries, and collected and edited the writings of others who had written before him. The present edition of his "Divers Voyages" is extremely well edited by Mr. J. Winter Jones, of the British Museum, who has prefaced it with an interesting sketch of Hakluyt's life, and added to the text many valuable notes.

The "Divers Voyages" themselves are much in the style of those collected by Mr. Thomas Rundall, and may be considered as forming a second volume of that work.

The "Memorials of Japan" consist of, first, a preface by the editor, Mr. Rundall, in which he gives a sketch of Japanese history in connexion with the Europeans, shewing

how at one time all nations were freely admitted into the now exclusive empire, and how they were banished thence in consequence of their own gross misconduct, making religious zeal an excuse for constant rebellion and misdemeanours. Secondly, a description of the "Kingdom of Japonia in the 16th Century," taken from "the Firste Booke of Relations of Moderne States," a manuscript of which the exact date is not known, though it may be nearly conjectured from the fact of Elizabeth's being mentioned as "the Princesse or Queene of England;" thirdly, a collection of letters written by William Adams, an Englishman of low birth, who was cast destitute upon the shores of Japan, and through his own talent, and the emperor's justice and munificence, acquired great wealth, and rose to the highest rank the emperor could bestow on him; fourthly and lastly, of a large collection of notes on various subjects connected with Japan and the Japanese. These are entertaining in the highest degree, and have been carefully selected from all writings, old and new, relating to the Japanese empire. Those who are interested in the subject cannot too much thank the Hakluyt Society, and more particularly the editor of this book, for giving them in one volume of good type, what has hitherto been scattered, and practically almost buried, in old manuscripts, to decipher which scarcely any motive short of a contemplated history of Japan would brace up one's courage. Within the small compass of this volume of some 200 pages is contained all the real knowledge that exists concerning the now closed empire.

From the notes we subjoin two curious extracts, illustrative of Japanese manners and ways of thinking. The first is an account of the manner of punishing men holding posts under government—soldiers, statesmen, &c. Instead of causing them to die by the hand of the executioner, the emperor, upon such an one's being convicted of crime, sends him an order to rip himself up. In contemplation of this casualty all persons subject to it carry about with them in travelling the official dress used upon the occasion of self-immolation—a white robe, destitute of the armorial bearings usually worn. The ceremony itself is thus regulated:—

"On the order of the sovereign being communicated to the offender he forthwith despatches invitations to his friends for a specified day. The visitors are regaled with *Zakhi*, (a strong-water distilled from rice,) and when a certain quantity has been drunk, the host takes leave of his friends, preparatory to the second reading of the order for his death. This being

done, usually among the highest, in the presence of the secretary and the government officer, the condemned man makes a speech or offers some complimentary address to the company; then inclining his head forward, he unsheathes his cattan, and inflicts two gashes on his abdomen, one horizontal, and the other perpendicular. A confidential servant, who is stationed for the purpose in the rear, immediately smites off the head of his master."

The performance of this peculiar kind of suicide is much studied in Japan, where the youth learn to slash themselves gracefully, as a necessary accomplishment, under efficient tutors. It is a mode of suicide chosen in all voluntary instances. Of such an instance our second extract affords a curious example:—

"Two high officers of the court met on the palace stairs, and jostled each other. One was an irascible man, and immediately demanded satisfaction. The other, of a placable disposition, represented that the circumstance was accidental, and tendered ample apology, representing that satisfaction could not be reasonably demanded. The irascible man, however, would not be appeased, and finding he could not provoke the other to a conflict, suddenly drew up his robes, unsheathed his cattan, and cut himself in the prescribed mode. As a point of honour his adversary was under the necessity of following his example, and the irascible man, before he breathed his last, had the gratification of seeing the object of his passion dying beside him."

This placable man, first trying to soothe his angry comrade by every concession consistent with honour, and still, when honour demanded it, unflinchingly inflicting on himself the fatal slash, gives us a high idea of the Japanese character. A third passage we had marked for extract, but for which we have not space, tells us of a noble Japanese lady who was forcibly robbed of her honour during the absence of her husband, and who, on his return, refused to receive him otherwise than as a guest till she should have revealed something to him, which she promised to do on the morrow. At the appointed time, she assembled her friends and relations, and, among them, the man who had dishonoured her. She then, weeping on her husband's shoulder, told her tale; but did not name the offender. Her husband and all the company endeavoured to shew her that she had done no wrong, though the author of her sorrow deserved death. She refused to be comforted, and springing suddenly from her husband's embrace, threw herself from the terrace. The unnamed culprit escaped amidst the confusion that followed, and was found by those who first descended, weltering in his blood by the

side of his victim: he had killed himself in the national manner.

"The Discovery and Conquest of Florida," is an exceedingly amusing history, written by a gentleman of Elvas, and translated from the Portuguese by the indefatigable Richard Hakluyt. It is now reprinted from the edition of 1611, not having been included in either of the editions of Hakluyt's celebrated collection; though it appeared in a supplement to that of 1809. There is, in addition, a translation from the Portuguese, relating some of the same incidents as the first. This translation is made by the editor, Mr. Rye, who has also written an amusing preface.

The next work issued by the Hakluyt Society is in two volumes, called "Notes upon Russia." They were written in Latin, by the Baron Sigismund von Herberstein, Ambassador from the Court of Germany to the Grand Prince Vasiley Ivanovich, in the years 1517 and 1526, and are now translated, for the first time, by Mr. Major. Not the least interesting part of this work is the editor's introduction, containing a biography of the author, which, together with some notices of Herberstein's predecessors in Russian history, form the great bulk of the first volume. Mr. Major has also given us three letters in verse, written by Master George Turbeville, who was attached to an embassy from Queen Elizabeth to the Court of Moscow, in 1568. This work, though not wanting in curious matter, is perhaps less fitted than any of the foregoing volumes for occupying a place among the publications of the Hakluyt Society. It is rather a history than a work of observation and travel, and though well worth attention at a time like this, when the past and future of Russia are felt to be matters of world-wide interest and import, we think that it would have been better if the Society had left its translation and republication to some more suitable source, particularly since it will take many years, at the present rate of publication, to issue the numerous "rare or unpublished Voyages and Travels," which it is the avowed object of the Hakluyt Society to place before the world.

The last work upon our list is of equal popular interest with, and of scientific importance considerably greater than, any of its predecessors. We very much regret that the circumstance of our not having received this volume until the bulk of this article was in type, should have made it impossible for us to consider the work in the

detailed manner it deserves. It contains the record of the three voyages of the much, but not enough famed Barents, in search of the North-East Passage. These voyages were performed nearly three hundred years ago, and with means and appliances far inferior to those of modern travellers; yet wonderful to say, this Dutchman may be considered as without a rival to this day, in the list of Arctic explorers. He succeeded in pushing his way twenty-four days' sail, and nearly one half the length of Nova Zembla, farther in the direction of the North-East Passage than any other discoverer before or since his time. He is also proved, by the editor of the present volume, who presents us with a map of Barents' course, according to his carefully recorded astronomical and other observations, to have circumnavigated Spitzbergen;—a feat not recorded as having been performed by any other man; yet, strange to say, into such neglect has the narrative of Barents' Arctic explorations fallen, and with so little care does it seem to have been at any time perused, that this fact is not alluded to by Barrow, Scoresby, Beechy, or any other writer on Arctic discovery.

The extreme northern point reached by Admiral Lütke, in his surveys in 1821–1824, was Cape Nassau, lat. $76^{\circ} 34'$, regarded by him as the same with the Cape Nassau of Barents, lat. $76^{\circ} 30'$. The Russian academician, Baer, differs from Lütke's opinion of the accuracy of the maps in which Barents' Land—as the editor rightly designates the coast north of Cape Nassau—is given, and considers Cape Nassau as the extreme north of Nova Zembla. But it is impossible to follow the track of Barents' observations in the present work, without feeling that the question is once for all decided against Baer. There can be little doubt but that Barents, with the help of steam and modern appliances, would have accomplished the North-East Passage. There is no part of his course which is recorded with greater minuteness than the coast north of Cape Nassau; and the perfect coincidence of his observations, south of that point, with those of the modern explorer of Nova Zembla, Lütke, makes it impossible to doubt but that the erasure of Barents' Land from the maps, by Ziwołka and Baer, must have arisen from a very imperfect acquaintance with the work here reprinted. So much for the scientific value of this volume. As regards its popular interest, we can only say, that it contains the description of one of the most marvellous and heroic feats of courage, energy, and patient endurance upon record.

The third and most notable voyage, when Barents succeeded in turning the northern extremity of Nova Zembla, was performed in a vessel of 50 tons burthen. He and his company spent ten months—the first Arctic wintering—in that inhospitable region, without a murmur, and returned the whole distance in open boats, (!!) exposed to danger and difficulties, overwhelming to anything short of the most heroic degree of Christian fortitude,—which seems to have been theirs. Barents died on this famous returning voyage, in the arms, as it were, of a most noble victory.

Concerning the editorship of this volume, by Dr. Beke, we need say no more than that the industry and sagacity which it exhibits are worthy of its great subject.

ART. V.—*The Church of Christ, in its Idea, Attributes, and Ministry, with a particular reference to the Controversy on the subject between Romanists and Protestants.* By EDWARD ARTHUR LITTON, M.A., Perpetual Curate of Stockton Heath, Cheshire, and late Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford.* London, 1851.

This is a work of great excellence, and of great importance. Mr. Litton is a man of decided ability, and thoroughly conversant with the subjects of which he treats, both in their scriptural and in their ecclesiastical aspects. The work is deserving of high commendation, both on account of the talent and erudition which it exhibits, and on account of the general soundness and practical importance of the views which it advocates. It discusses topics which are of peculiar interest and importance in the present day, and it discusses most of them in a way well fitted, in our judgment, to advance the interests of truth. Mr. Litton takes his stand, firmly and decidedly, on the great scriptural principles with respect to the Church, which were maintained by the great body of the Reformers, including the Reformers of the Church of England; and by a vigorous and effective application of these principles, he overturns from the foundation the notions on which some of the leading departments of the Popish and Tractarian systems are based.

The question as to what is the true doctrine of Scripture on the nature and properties of the Church, enters as an element of

* We rejoice to see that since the publication of this work, Mr. Litton has been appointed Vice-Principal of St. Edmund Hall, Oxford.

fundamental importance into the controversy between Protestants and Romanists. Bos-suët, one of the most skilful and dexterous defenders of Romanism, was accustomed to advise Papists, when disputing with Protestants, to begin with the subject of the Church. And the advice was undoubtedly judicious; 1st, because Papists can support their views on the subject of the Church, with fully as much plausibility as any of those tenets in which they differ from Protestants, and 2d, because the establishment of Popish views on the subject of the Church, goes far to settle in their favour the whole controversy between them and their opponents. Romanists hold up the Church as a rule or standard of faith, and when they undertake to establish its claims in this character from Scripture, the one common standard in the authority of which both parties are agreed, and from which therefore, according to the rules of sound reasoning, all legitimate discussion between them must take its origin, Protestants are bound to meet their arguments, and to prove that they are insufficient for the purpose for which they are adduced. The "Church principles" which the Tractarians have so strenuously defended, and of the value and importance of which they have been so much in the habit of boasting, are certain notions, of a Popish complexion, with respect to the nature and properties of the Church, including its sacraments and ministry. And the process of transition from Tractarianism to Popery, which has been going on so extensively of late, has been manifestly produced, just by men having been led to form more clear and definite conceptions of these Church principles, and to follow them out more boldly and honestly to their legitimate results.

The question as to what is the true scriptural definition or description of the Church, formed an important subject of controversy between the Reformers and the Church of Rome, and hence the prominence given to this topic in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches, as well as in the theological systems of the Romanists. The defenders of the Church of Rome have usually laboured to introduce into the definition or description of the Church, some ideas or elements which might go, more or less fully, to foreclose the general questions at issue between them and their opponents, while Protestants have directed their efforts to prove, that scriptural views of the Church give no countenance to the introduction of these ideas or elements into the definition or description that ought to be given of it; but on the contrary, leave all the particular questions at issue, to be decided by an appeal to the true meaning

and import of the sacred Scriptures. The definition of the visible Church, or rather of a visible Church, given in the Nineteenth Article of the Church of England, is thoroughly Protestant, and entirely accordant with the views generally held by the Reformers. It is this, that "the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful (believing) men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance, in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same." This definition must be held in all fairness to teach by plain implication, 1st, that the right or title of any society to be considered a Church of Christ, is not to be determined by the form of its external government, and, 2d, that its claim to this character must be decided, by an examination of the substantial accordance of its doctrines, and of its teaching and practice in regard to the sacraments, with the mind and will of Christ as revealed in the Scriptures. These positions were held by all the Reformers, including those of the Church of England. The first of them overturns the principle of the Papists and of the High Church Prelatists, as to subjection to the Bishop of Rome, or to any bishop, being an essential or determining characteristic of the true Church. The second establishes the propriety of the doctrines professed by any society, taking precedence of the inquiry into anything else, such as its general government or the unbroken succession of its ministry, alleged to affect its ecclesiastical standing, and the right of all to conduct this investigation for themselves by a direct appeal to Scripture, untrammelled by any pretensions to ecclesiastical authority. These are the true principles of Protestantism, and they have been held by all Protestants worthy of the name—by all but High Church Prelatists.

The influential bearing of these questions upon the controversy between Protestants and Romanists, may be illustrated by a reference to one topic that has often been discussed between them. The Papists have always been accustomed to employ against Protestants an argument to this effect: Where there is no valid ministry, there can be no true Church: Protestants have not a valid ministry, and, therefore, they are not a true Church. The major proposition in this syllogism is based on the general idea, that certain external qualities or features in the ministry, determine the right of a society to be considered a true Church. The reformers denied this principle, and disproved it by showing that there are no materials in Scripture which require, or even warrant,

the introduction of any specific doctrine concerning the ministry into the definition of the Church, or into the description of what is essential to it. Papists of course laboured to establish their minor proposition, by trying to show, that no ministry is valid except that which can be traced, through an unbroken series of episcopal ordinations, to the apostles. The Reformers were accustomed to meet this argument of the Romanists in this way: Wherever there is a true Church, there is, or may be, a valid ministry: Protestant societies are true Churches, and, therefore, they have, or may have, a right or title to, a valid ministry. The major proposition in this syllogism, it will be observed, goes somewhat beyond the mere negation of the Popish major. It asserts not only that the question of the ministry does *not* settle the question of the Church, but also, moreover, that the question of the Church *does* settle the question of the ministry, the question of the Church being to be determined by a fair application of the elements which alone Scripture warrants us to introduce into the definition of the Church, or into the description of what is essential to it. This view of the relation of the two subjects, the Church and the ministry, was held by the Reformers; it is implied in the position laid down in the Westminster Confession, that "to the catholic visible Church, Christ hath *given the ministry, oracles, and ordinances of God,*" (c. xxv. s. 3,) and it is elaborately maintained in Claude's Defence of the Reformation.

There are, however, some questions regarding the Church, controverted between the Romanists and the Protestants, which are not directly settled by anything usually embodied in the definition or description of what is commonly called the visible Church, and which must be determined by a more thorough investigation of the primary and fundamental meaning of the word *Church* in Scripture. Romanists usually contend that there is no other and higher meaning of the word *Church* in its application to men while on earth, than as a designation of those, taken collectively, who make an external profession of faith in Christ, or what Protestants commonly call the visible Church. Protestants deny this, and maintain, that the primary and fundamental sense of the word *Church* as used in Scripture, is, that it designates the multitude or company of the *κληροί*, the called, those who are really brought into vital union with Christ by true faith, and are ultimately saved. If the word is really used in Scripture in this sense, as Protestants think they can prove, then it is evident, from the nature of the case, that

this must be the primary, guiding, meaning of the word, that from which its other meanings must be derived, and by a reference to which they must be in some measure determined. Protestants have been accustomed to speak of the Church in this its primary sense as invisible, because men cannot know with certainty during this life who the particular individuals are of whom it is composed.

If the Church in its primary sense is composed of those, and those only, who are united to Christ by faith, then this connects the whole subject of the Church with most important doctrinal principles, and must materially affect all the views that ought to be taken of its nature and functions. More than one half of Mr. Litton's work is occupied with an investigation of the Spiritual "idea" of the Church, as comprehending the important questions which have now been briefly stated. The discussion of them is very complete and satisfactory. It exhibits not only a thorough acquaintance with the special subjects under consideration, but an accurate knowledge of the substance of Christian theology, or the general scheme of doctrine taught in Scripture, a department in which a large proportion of the Church of England divines, who have engaged in the Popish controversy since the period of the Restoration and the Act of Uniformity, have been greatly deficient. It furnishes an excellent antidote to the zealous efforts which have been made of late to diffuse Popish and High-Church notions of the Church and its government, including what are sometimes called the sacerdotal and sacramental principles. It ably advocates, and conclusively establishes from Scripture, views upon all these points, which are thoroughly Protestant and evangelical, and entirely accordant with the grounds taken up by all the ablest defenders of the Reformation.

We are naturally led to contrast this work of Mr. Litton's with the "Treatise on the Church of Christ," published some years ago by Mr. Palmer, one of the originators of the Tractarian movement. Mr. Palmer is entitled to some respect, because of the manliness and decision with which he denounced the infidel tendency of the development theory, as put forth by Newman and his friends, even before they left the Church of England, and because of the firmness and tenacity with which he continues even now to cling to the *via media*, the narrow and slippery path which, it is alleged, runs half way between Protestantism and Popery. His treatise on the Church displays considerable ability and extensive erudition, and contains a good

deal of valuable and interesting information. It is an elaborate and unshrinking defence of the High-Church notions, which were propagated in the Church of England in Archbishop Laud's time, and have been maintained by the Nonjurors and the Tractarians.

Mr. Palmer's views with respect to the nature and constitution, the qualities and prerogatives, of the Church, are, of course to a large extent, identical in substance with those of Romanists, but are not followed out with the completeness and consistency which characterize the Popish system. The great practical difficulty which presses upon Anglican Tractarians and High Churchmen, in carrying out their principles fully, is the want of any adequate or decent representative of the Church, the want of any party who can be plausibly set forth as possessing and exercising the prerogatives which they ascribe to the Church in general. They concur with Romanists in applying to the Church as an external visible society, statements in Scripture, which, in the judgment of Protestants, apply only to the Church as designating the whole body of the redeemed and the saved. "Church principles" represent the Church, viewed as an external visible society, as conveying to men and conferring upon them, especially through the priesthood and the sacraments, the spiritual blessings which are necessary to salvation. The claims thus put forth on behalf of the Church manifestly require that it should possess infallibility or something like it, in order that it may rightly execute its high functions, and secure due submission and obedience to its authority. Papists provide for all this by ascribing infallibility to the Pope or to General Councils, and by representing the Romish See as the centre of unity and the source of authority to the whole Church. But the Tractarians have no party to whom, as representing the Church, they could decently or plausibly ascribe these high prerogatives. It would be palpably absurd, and somewhat dangerous, to ascribe them to the Archbishop of Canterbury, or to the Bench of Bishops, or to the Convocation. On this account, the infallibility and supreme authority of the Church are usually rather insinuated by Anglicans, than boldly and openly maintained; and Church principles, in their hands, become a miserable abortion, fitted only to lead men to adopt the more manly and consistent course of joining the Church of Rome.

This essential weakness of Anglican High-Churchism is well illustrated by Mr. Palmer's work; but what we wish at present especially to notice, is the miserable ignor-

ance it displays of the fundamental principles of Christian theology, a point of primary importance in which it contrasts most unfavourably with Mr. Litton's work. In arguing against the doctrine, that the proper matter of the Church, in the highest sense, is saints or holy men, he gives us to understand, that men may have repentance and faith, without having regeneration or piety. He disproves the above-mentioned position of the "Dissenters," with whom he is arguing, by trying to shew, that the baptism by which men are admitted into the visible Church does not imply regeneration and piety, while he admits that it implies repentance and faith. He says, "the only conditions for baptism (as administered by the Apostles) were repentance and faith: there was no mention of regeneration, sanctity, real piety, whether visible or invisible, as prerequisites to its reception." (Part I., chap. xiii., sec. 3.) What conception can Mr. Palmer have of repentance and faith, of regeneration and piety? Is it not plain, that, with all his erudition, he is still grossly ignorant of the first principles of God's oracles?

One great excellence of Mr. Litton's book is, that it is based upon sound scriptural views of theology, of the leading doctrines revealed in Scripture, concerning the great object of Jesus Christ in establishing a Church on earth, and the way and manner in which men individually become possessed of the blessings of salvation, and are prepared for the kingdom of heaven. The great doctrines of Scripture on these subjects, as they are set forth in the Confessions of the Reformed Churches and in the Articles of the Church of England, Mr. Litton fully understands and appreciates; and he faithfully and ably applies them in his exposition of the *Idea*, the *Attributes*, and the *Ministry* of the Church of Christ.

We have not space or leisure at present to discuss the important topics brought before us in Mr. Litton's work, whether those in which we agree with, or those in which we differ from, him; and we shall confine ourselves to the humbler task of simply describing what the work contains, allowing the author to speak for himself. The work is one which we think it very desirable that the clergy of the Church of England should read and ponder. It is well worthy of their careful study; and if its views were generally embraced by them, this would go far to bring back that important institution to the Protestant and evangelical position, which it occupied for the greater part of a century after its reformation from Popery.

Mr. Litton has indicated some views on the subject of infant baptism from which we decidedly dissent, believing them to be unfounded in themselves, and wholly unnecessary for the purpose for which they are adduced, viz., the refutation of the figment of baptismal regeneration. We differ from him also in some of his views as to the binding authority of Apostolic practice in matters of Church government. But notwithstanding these exceptions, we regard the work as embodying a very large amount of important Protestant truth.

The first Book, occupying more than one half of the volume, is devoted to the exposition of the "Idea" of the Church, or in other words, to the investigation of what the elements are, which the word of God warrants and requires us to introduce into the definition of the Church, or the description of what constitutes it or is essential to it. The first thing to be done is to bring out fully the opposite views of Romanists and Protestants in regard to the idea of the Church. This is done chiefly by producing quotations from the Trent Catechism in the one case, and from the Confessions of the Reformed Churches in the other. After giving a number of extracts from Protestant Confessions and Catechisms, Mr. Litton presents the following summary of what they concur in teaching upon this subject:—

"Whatever be the merits or defects of Protestantism, it is evident, from the foregoing extracts, that it is not, as Bossuet would have us believe, a system of chaotic inconsistencies: the unanimity of sentiment, and even similarity of expression, proving that, however they may have occasionally clothed their ideas in ill-chosen language, the Reformers had a consistent view of their own, and were well aware at what points it diverged from that of their opponents. If the reader compares together the statements of the several formularies, he will perhaps deem the following a sufficiently accurate representation of the distinctive teaching of Protestantism on the subject of the idea of the Church.

"The one true Church, the holy Catholic Church of the Creed, is not a body of mixed composition, comprehending within its pale both the evil and the good: it is the community of those who, wherever they may be, are in living union with Christ by faith, and partake of the sanctifying influences of His Spirit. Properly, it comprises, besides its members now upon earth, all who shall ultimately be saved. In its more confined acceptation, the phrase denotes the body of true believers existing at any given time in the world.

"The true Church is so far invisible as that it is not yet manifested in its corporate capacity; or, in other words, there is no one society, or visible corporation upon earth, of which it

can be said that it is the mystical body of Christ. Hence, of course, the Head of this body is not visible.

"Particular churches, otherwise unconnected societies, are one by reason of their common relation to, and connexion with, the one true Church or mystical body of Christ. The outward notes of this connexion, and therefore of a true visible Church, are, the pure preaching of the Word (in fundamentals at least), and the administration of the Sacraments 'according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' These are the two indispensable notes of a true Church: to them may be added, though it stands not in the same order of necessity, the exercise of discipline.

"Although visible Churches are, according to the idea, 'congregations of saints,' i.e., of really sanctified persons, and must be regarded as such if they are to have the name of Churches, yet they are never really so: in point of fact, they are always mixed communities, comprising hypocrites and nominal Christians, as well as true believers, a perfect separation between whom is, in the present life, impossible, and is reserved to the second coming of Christ to judgment. Hence the aggregate of visible Christian Churches throughout the world is not exactly identical with the true Church, which, as has been said, consists only of the living members of Christ.

"Such notes as, 'the succession of Bishops,' 'antiquity,' 'amplitude,' 'the name of Catholic,' &c., are, *taken alone*, not sufficient to prove a society to be a true Church of Christ.

"To the one true Church, the body of Christ, properly belong the promises of perpetuity, of the continued presence of Christ, and of preservation from fundamental error. The same may be said of the attributes of the Church, Unity, Sanctity, &c.; these, in their full and proper sense, can be predicated only of that body of Christ which is not yet fully manifested."—*Pr.* 50–52.

Mr. Litton is duly aware of the importance, in order to anything like a satisfactory discussion, of bringing out fully and accurately the true state of the question, or the precise points on which the contending parties agree and differ. Our readers will, we think, be interested in the following masterly statement upon this point:—

"The real point of distinction, then, between the two parties, consists, not in one's denying, and the other's maintaining, that the Church may be regarded from a twofold point of view, according as we make what is visible, and what is invisible in it, the subject of consideration; but in the relative importance, and the relative position, which each party, respectively, assigns to those two aspects of the Church. The difference is this:—the Romanist, while admitting that there is, or ought to be, in the Church an interior life, not cognisable by human eye, yet regards this as a separable accident, and makes the essence of the Church to consist in what is external and visi-

ble; the Protestant, on the contrary, while admitting that to be visible is an inseparable property of the Church, makes the essence thereof to consist in what is spiritual and unseen; viz., the work of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of Christians. The one defines the Church by its outward, the other by its inward, characteristics. Neither party can absolutely refuse assent to the well-known aphorism of Irenæus, 'ubi ecclesia ibi et spiritus Dei; ubi spiritus Dei ibi ecclesia;' but since, in its two clauses, that aphorism may be held to represent different tendencies, on the one hand, to make the presence of the Spirit dependent upon, and posterior in point of time to, the existence of the Church, and, on the other, to make the existence of the Church dependent upon the presence of the Spirit, it accurately expresses the true point of controversy between Romanists and Protestants. To the question, What is the Church? the Romanist replies that it is a visible institution, in which men are placed in order to be made holy, and thus qualified for the presence of God hereafter; while the answer of the Protestant is, that according to its true idea (*proprie principaliter dicta*), it is a society of those who are sanctified (*pro ratione hujus vitæ*) by the Spirit of God, and possess within them the earnest of the future inheritance: the former holds that to constitute a person a member of the Church, and therefore a member of Christ himself, it suffices that he *profess* the Christian faith, partake outwardly of the sacraments, and be subject to the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome; the latter maintains that he only properly belongs to the Church who is in vital union with the Saviour by faith, and partakes of the quickening influence of Christ's Spirit. The distinction which the Romanist admits to exist between the living and the dead members of the Church, does not affect his definition of the latter, for he makes a distinction between church-membership and a state of salvation; the latter, indeed, can only be affirmed of those who are renewed in heart, but the former may be enjoyed even by those who are living in mortal sin. Divesting thus the idea of the Church, in its ultimate state, of everything moral, that is, making it a thing indifferent to the idea whether the Spirit of God, in his sanctifying influences, be present or not, he is, of course, compelled to consider the Church as, primarily, an external institution; the *differentia*, or specific difference, of which, lies in its policy, its rites, or its episcopal succession. The Protestant, on the contrary, can make no distinction between being a member of the Church, and being in a state of salvation; and as, confessedly, an inward change, the work of the Spirit, is necessary to salvation, for 'unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,' it is, in his eyes, equally necessary to true church-membership; or, in other words, he defines the Church to be, primarily, a community of saints, making the presence of the Spirit the specific difference of the body, its visible polity a matter of secondary moment. Or, the difference may be thus stated: the Romanist regards that which is visible in the Church as the antecedent; the

Protestant as the consequent of the life within; the former attributes a positive and independent value to the outward characteristics of the body; the latter values them chiefly as the evidences of the unseen work of the Spirit. Moehler is fairer and more accurate than usual, when he says, 'that the difference between the Protestant and the Romanist view of the Church may be briefly stated as follows:—the Romanist teaches that the visible Church is first in the order of time, afterwards the invisible; the relation of the former to the latter being that of cause and effect. The Lutherans (Protestants), on the contrary, affirm that the visible Church owes its existence to the invisible, the latter being the true basis of the former.' He adds, very justly, that this apparent unimportant difference of view is pregnant with important results.

"That the difference of view just mentioned lies at the root of the statements of the rival Confessions will be evident from the most cursory inspection of them. To recur to the positions of the Romish Catechism. Were we to frame from them a definition of the Church, it would be, that it is a company of men professing faith in Christ, outwardly partaking of the Sacraments, and in communion with the Roman pontiff; it being, as regards the idea, a matter of indifference whether they be, or be not sanctified by the Spirit of God. That this is the true doctrine of Rome is evident from the frequency and emphasis with which the Catechism affirms that both the good and the evil are, though in a different sense, yet equally as far as the definition, which expresses the idea of the thing defined, is concerned, members of the Church; for, if this be true, it is clear that the essential being of the Church must lie, not in the internal work of the Holy Spirit, which, confessedly, as an active principle of holiness, is not found in all who are visibly within the ecclesiastical pale, but in that which may be common to the evil and the good; viz., subjection to the same central authority, and outward participation in the same Sacraments. The unrenewed in heart can, equally with those who are led by the Holy Spirit, *profess* faith in Christ, 'earnestly and visibly press with' their 'teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ,' and be under the jurisdiction of lawful pastors; and if this is all that is meant by being a member of Christ, that is, if internal union with the Saviour is not essential to the idea of the Church, most true it is that no reason exists why we should not apply that title to those whose lives prove them to be destitute of sanctifying faith, so long as they are not openly excommunicated. The Jew, however morally corrupt he might be, yet, as long as he fulfilled the requirements of the ceremonial law, was a recognised member of the Hebrew commonwealth and entitled to the temporal privileges thereto belonging; from which we justly infer that the Jewish economy was one rather of the letter than of the spirit, and had its essential being in its polity and ceremonial. The same inference must be drawn with respect to the Christian dispensation, if it be true, as the Romish Catechism affirms, that the

good and the evil are equally members of the Church, and equally partakers of Christian privileges."—Pp. 70-74.

This is followed by a very full and elaborate exposition of the scriptural evidence in support of the Protestant, and in opposition to the Popish, idea of the Church. The evidence is collected from the whole word of God, and is classed under three heads, that derived from the Jewish dispensation, from the Christian dispensation, and from the teaching of the Apostolic Epistles.

This investigation into the meaning and import of Scripture is conducted in a very satisfactory and scholar-like way, and is of course thoroughly successful. It would have admitted with advantage of being somewhat condensed, as from its great length it rather overloads the book. The following passage presents a good summary of what it is shewn that Scripture sanctions upon this subject, exhibited in a way that exposes some of the ordinary Popish misrepresentations regarding it.

"It appears, then, that there is scriptural foundation for the distinction between the Church as the mystical body of Christ and the Church as an aggregate of local Christian societies; and we may add, in the words of Hooker, that 'for lack of diligent observing the difference, the oversights are neither few nor light that have been committed.' Romanism disposes of the difficulty by putting aside all that Scripture says concerning visible churches as separate, independent, communities, and applying its statements respecting the mystical body of Christ to the visible community of which the Pope is the head; they who reject the Romish theory, and yet deny the distinction, are compelled to resort to artificial explanations of the language of the inspired writers, and to suppose that they describe a thing which has not, and cannot have, any real existence on earth. The distinction being admitted, all becomes clear. The Apostles speak of visible churches, as the churches of Rome or Corinth; but they also speak of one body, which is united to one Head, and governed by one Spirit; if there is not here, to say the least, a two-fold aspect under which the Church is viewed, it is difficult to say what meaning we are to attach to the language of Scripture. The two-fold aspect is, as has been said, the Church as it is visible and the Church in its truth; the distinction which Scripture makes being, we may presume, expressly intended to impress upon us the fact that the two are not absolutely identical; that with the Church as it appears in the world, elements are in conjunction which do not belong to it as the body of Christ,—that is, as regarded according to its true idea. In the latter point of view, the Church, though it has a real, substantive existence, is, as a body, not visible, because no human eye can discern that which makes it really the body of Christ,—viz., vital union with Christ: hence the expression 'mys-

tical body,' which signifies that the object denoted by it is one, not of sight but of faith.

"Do we, then, make the true Church absolutely invisible, or affirm that there are two Churches, one visible, the other invisible? In answering these questions, we shall be led to make some observations upon the Protestant doctrine of the invisible Church, respecting which so much misapprehension has prevailed; as well as upon the connexion between the Church visible and the Church invisible, or the manner in which the latter becomes visible.

"It must be admitted that the expression 'invisible Church,' commonly adopted in the Protestant formularies and in the writings of the Reformers, was unhappily chosen; for it gave occasion to the papal theologians to charge their adversaries sometimes with reducing the Church to a platonic republic, having no actual existence, and sometimes with making two distinct Churches,—a visible and an invisible one. Yet the meaning of the expression is sufficiently clear, and involves nothing absurd or inconsistent. When Protestants speak of the invisible Church, what they mean is, the mystical body of Christ, as distinguished from local churches; and when they say that the body of Christ, or the true Church, is invisible, they mean nothing more than that that which makes us members of the body of Christ, or of the true Church—viz., saving faith in Christ—is invisible; it is but another mode of expressing the truth that, not outward participation of the Sacraments, but inward, and therefore invisible, union with Christ is that in which the essential being of the Church lies; and that, consequently, they only are in the full sense of the words, of the Church who are in Christ by a living faith, and are under the influence of His Spirit. Accordingly, the Reformers would have better expressed their meaning, and avoided the risk of misrepresentation, had they, instead of saying that the true Church is invisible, simply affirmed that that which constitutes the true being of the Church is invisible. That this was the idea intended to be conveyed by a somewhat inconvenient terminology is abundantly evident from the earlier Protestant confessions, in which that terminology is not as yet found: the Tetrapolitan confession (A. D. 1530), for example, which nowhere speaks of the Church as being invisible; while yet it clearly intimates in what sense that phrase, which afterwards became a common one, is to be understood. '*Although that,*' it says, '*which makes the Church of Christ what it is,—viz., faith in Christ—is invisible,* the Church itself is visible, and can be known by its fruits.'—Pp. 320-323.

"The true Church, or body of Christ, is, according to Protestantism, invisible, inasmuch as that which makes us members of it—viz., vital union with Christ—is invisible, and none can know with certainty who are thus in union with Christ, and who are not. He who does know 'them that are His,' and could at any moment separate the wheat from the chaff, will not, we know, do so until He comes again to judgment. Then, indeed, the 'manifestation of the sons of God' will take place, and the holy Catholic Church, at present an object of faith, will become an object of sight; but until then, it is, as

regards its proper organic unity, or in its corporate capacity, invisible. How, then, does its existence become known; for, as we have seen, the Protestant confessions, not less than the Catechism of Trent, affirm that it is, in one sense, visible? We reply that the one true Church becomes visible, not in its proper unity under Christ its Head, but under the form of particular congregations or churches, which are one by virtue of their presumed and, if they are true churches of Christ, actual and inseparable connexion with the one body of Christ. The latter, invisible in its proper corporate capacity, appears or becomes visible at Jerusalem, Corinth, Rome, England, &c., whether the Christian society at each of those places consist of one congregation or of an aggregate of congregations under a common government. Here we see the true import of the Protestant 'notes' of the Church. The Protestant confessions assign no notes to the one true Church: were they to do so, they would be taking up the ground which the adversary occupies: what they assign notes to are the visible churches of Christ, concerning which they affirm that that is a true Church in which the Word is truly preached, and the Sacraments duly administered. And they do so, because they believe that wherever the pure word is preached, and the sacraments administered, there will be a part of Christ's body; the presence of which actual, or at any rate presumed, makes the local Christian society a true Church. The Word and the Sacraments are the means by which the new life is both imparted and sustained: we are certain, therefore, with the certainty of faith, that wherever these means are in active operation, the Spirit of God will by them both generate the sons of God and nourish them unto life eternal; certain, consequently, not that the local church, *as such*, is a part of Christ's body, but that *there*, in that locality there will be a portion of the latter. The local church remains a true church, whatever be the inward state of its members, so long as in it are found the preaching of the Word and the Sacraments; but it is a part of the true Church only so far as it actually is what it professes to be,—a congregation of faithful men, or saints.

"The point of inseparable connexion between the Church as invisible and the same Church as visible will now be understood. It is this:—the members of Christ's body are never to be sought for save in the visible Churches of Christ: extra cœtum vocatorum non sunt quærendi electi. The true Church cannot, at present, manifest itself otherwise than under the form of local Christian communities; where they are, therefore, there, and not elsewhere, it is."—Pp. 325–327.

The establishment of these positions from Scripture virtually settles the whole question of the Church, in so far as it bears upon the points controverted between Protestants on the one hand, and Romanists and Tractarians on the other. But the principles thus established require to be applied to a variety of topics which have been matter of controversial discussion, and this is

done by Mr. Litton fully and successfully in the 2d and 3d books. The 2d book treats of the notes and attributes of the Church; and on the first of these heads Mr. Litton gives an able defence of the truth and relevancy of the two notes usually assigned by Protestants as marks of the true Church, or of true visible Churches, in other words, as the means of testing whether any particular visible society is entitled to be regarded as a true and real portion of the visible Catholic Church of Christ, viz., the preaching of the pure word of God and the due administration of the Sacraments. He indicates also pretty plainly, that for himself he would not object much to follow the example of some of the old Presbyterians in adding a third note of a similar kind, viz., the orderly administration of ecclesiastical discipline. Under the second head of the attributes or predicates of the Church, he considers the topics usually discussed by Romanists under the name of the notes or marks of the Church,—unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, dealing with them in such a way as to bring out their unfitness to serve Tractarian as well as Popish purposes. He dwells especially on the unity of the Church, a subject by the skilful management of which Papists and Tractarians are often very successful in making an impression on men's minds. Under this head he discusses and disproves the favourite notion of the Anglican High Churchmen, that the external organic unity of the Church is constituted by, and is dependent on, the existence of the episcopate, or of a prelatic form of government. He disproves this notion by establishing the following positions, 1st, that Prelacy is not of Divine institution, and is not binding upon the Church *jure divino*; and, 2d, that it cannot be proved, *by the testimony of Scripture alone*, to have been of apostolic origin. He gives the state of the question, and the divisions under which he intends to discuss it, in the following passage:—

"In pursuance of the plan laid down, we have now to inquire whether and how far the organic unity of the mystical body of Christ, which in its proper essence is internal and unseen, has succeeded in producing any visible representation of itself; whether, and how far, a visible organic unity is attainable, and has been attained? In discussing this question, we are necessarily led to consider the origin and nature of the episcopate, the third of those orders of the ministry for which a divine authority is claimed; a subject which, though its natural place may seem to be in immediate connexion with the foregoing inquiry concerning the rudiments of ecclesiastical polity, has been purposely reserved for discussion under the head

of the unity of the Church. For whatever other functions and prerogatives belong, according to the Church theory, to the episcopate, it is of the three orders of the ministry that to which emphatically is assigned the office of representing the unity of the Church: while presbyters and deacons are but congregational officers, the bishop, on the contrary, is the representative of an order divinely instituted to be the means of binding the whole Church together, and to be the organ of its visible unity.

"That episcopacy should be represented by these writers as of divine institution—nay, traced up to Christ's own appointment—is only what might have been expected. As a part of that visible polity in which the essence or differentia of the Church is supposed to lie, it must claim this character; but besides what it has in common with the other two orders, it possesses a sacredness and an importance peculiar to itself. Of all the three, it is the most essential to the Church, the most divine. The bishop is to each believer the representative of Christ, the chief organ through whom the covenanted grace of God is derived to the Church at large. More important still is the privilege which he only possesses, of furnishing the Church with pastors: presbyters may spiritually generate the sons of God, but presbyters themselves can only be generated by the bishop. He is in each Church the symbol and centre of unity. Moreover, the Church being an institution for moulding men, by means of outward discipline, into the image of God, the power of coercion, which is necessary to carry out such a system, and which must be lodged somewhere, is committed to the bishop, who is the repository of the Church's legislative and executive authority. Obedience to the bishop is therefore obedience to Christ himself. Such is each bishop in his own diocese;—a mighty spiritual potentate, invested with plenary authority over God's heritage, and accountable to none but Christ himself. From such a view of episcopacy, it follows, of course, that it is essential to the very being of a Church; for where there is no bishop, there is no covenanted grace, no legitimate ministry, no sacraments. This conclusion may not be actually drawn from the premises: exceptions and allowances may be introduced into the theory: subtle distinctions may be instituted between the unavoidable and the culpable abandonment of the episcopal polity: but all such saving clauses are admitted at the expense of logical consistency, for if the essence of the Church lie in a certain external polity, the absence of that polity, however occasioned, must involve the destruction of the subject, just as the dissolution of the human body, whether it be the consequence of accident, or of an act of self-destruction, terminates the earthly existence of the individual.

"The historical facts bearing upon this subject must now be investigated, and the results laid before the reader. If these facts furnish good reason for believing that the episcopate was instituted on the same principle which guided the Apostles in the institution of the two inferior orders,—that, like them, it came into being, not as a divinely prescribed ordinance without which the Church could have no ex-

istence, but simply as a supply for a felt want, an extension of the organization of Christian societies called for by the circumstances of those societies, and of the age,—that, in short, episcopacy is the offspring of the Church, not the Church of episcopacy,—we shall have gained an additional confirmation of the conclusion already arrived at, viz., that the Church is not, in its idea, an institution of external discipline, but has its true being, its specific difference, within. In this point of view, the following remarks may be regarded as a kind of supplement to those already made in a preceding section on the polity of the Church, and therefore as completing the proof of the main position insisted upon in the first part of the present work.

"With the view of fully considering the subject, it is proposed, in the following inquiry, to examine, first, whether episcopacy can be proved to be of divine right, or to have been instituted by Christ himself; secondly, whether the *sole* evidence of Scripture is sufficient to enable us to pronounce it to be of apostolic institution; and lastly, whether we can fairly draw this latter conclusion from the *joint* testimony of Scripture and ecclesiastical history."—Pp. 394-398.

The first two of these questions he answers in the negative, and the third in the affirmative, and expounds very ably and candidly the grounds on which he bases these conclusions. He shows that no sufficient argument in support of the Divine or apostolic institution of Episcopacy can be derived, from the mission by our Saviour of the twelve and the seventy, from the pretended succession of bishops to the Apostles, from the alleged Episcopate of James at Jerusalem, or from the cases of Timothy and Titus, though he thinks that some of these topics afford satisfactory answers to the arguments by which it has been attempted to prove, that episcopacy is unlawful and unwarrantable. On the third question proposed for consideration Mr. Litton states his opinion in this way:—"However difficult it may be to establish from Scripture *alone* the apostolicity of episcopacy, we have yet the strongest ground for believing it to be an apostolical institution. *But the weight of the evidence rests upon uninspired testimony*, or rather upon that testimony combined with the precedents furnished by Scripture. By the aid of history and Scripture combined, it may be satisfactorily made out that Apostles either instituted or sanctioned the episcopal form of Church government."—P. 430.

Mr. Litton has made so many important concessions under the two former heads, that we would not feel disposed at present to enter the lists with him on this third head, even if we had room for discussion; and all the less do we feel called upon to attempt this, because, with his usual discrimination

and candour, he fully concedes, that the impossibility of proving the apostolicity of episcopacy from Scripture alone, and the necessity of calling in ordinary uninspired historical testimony in order to make out the case, essentially affects the question as to the universal permanent obligation of episcopacy, and its necessity in order to the maintenance of the unity of the Church. This last topic is one of great practical importance in its bearing not only upon prelacy, but on many other subjects, and it is admirably well put by Mr. Litton in the following passage:—

“There is, no doubt, a wide difference, as regards binding authority, between those of the apostolic appointments which are recorded in Scripture, and those the proof of which rests upon uninspired testimony. As regards the former, we are absolutely certain of the fact, inasmuch as we have it from the immediate followers of the Apostles, and from persons supernaturally preserved from error; whereas, in the latter case, we depend upon the testimony of those who, for the most part, only transmit to us what they themselves had received from others, and who, being uninspired, were liable to human error and imperfection. When Ignatius, or Clement, tells us that such and such practices or institutions proceeded from the Apostles, or that they heard so from others, there is no *prima facie* reason why we should not give credence to their testimony; but, inasmuch as we tread upon uninspired ground, we are compelled to be more circumspect in dealing with the evidence, and, above all, to consider carefully whether the alleged apostolical ordinances accord, in its spirit, with the undoubted principles of apostolical policy recorded in Holy Scripture. For to admit, without limitation, Augustin’s maxim, that, whatever is universally prevalent in the Church, must, for this sole reason, be ascribed to the Apostles, is to open a wide door to abuse; stamping, as it does, with apostolic sanction, every superstitious and unscriptural practice which can plead in its behalf antiquity and universality. If the practice or institution in question is manifestly opposed to the spirit of the apostolic regulations as set forth in Scripture, we may be sure, however ancient it may profess to be, that it is not apostolic; in other words, that it has not really existed from the first. Furthermore, the appointments of the Apostles, which are actually recorded in Scripture, derive, from that very fact, an importance which does not belong to those which we gather from uninspired testimony, however unexceptionable that testimony may be. We may have equally strong grounds for believing that any two appointments are of apostolic origin; and yet if one rests upon the testimony of Scripture, while the other has been handed down to us by uninspired history, they can by no means be placed in the same category; the difference in the medium of proof making a difference between them, not as regards the fact, but as regards their binding force. This follows from the peculiar place which Scripture holds in the Church of Christ.

Scripture contains that portion of the apostolical teaching, and the apostolical appointments, which is necessary either to the being or the wellbeing of the Church: it is the gift of God to His people, comprehending all the essential principles of Christianity, and belonging, like the Apostles, its authors, to the universal Church of every age; on which account its omissions are as significant as its contents. An apostolic appointment therefore, which is found recorded in Scripture, may be presumed to be of permanent use, and to possess a binding force, not so much because it is apostolic, for this another ordinance not found in Scripture may equally be, as because it is recorded in Scripture, because it forms part of that divinely superintended selection of the apostolic practices which we possess in the inspired Word. The apostolicity of each may be equally undoubted: it is the vehicle of transmission that makes the difference. The application of this principle admits of degrees. Appointments which are so distinctly stated in Scripture to have proceeded from the Apostles as to need no confirmation of testimony from other quarters, must be considered as more necessary to the Church than those which require extra Scriptural evidence to establish their claims; for we must believe that even the *proportions* in which Scripture unfolds divine truth, the *relative distinctions* with which it records the facts of early church history, are the result of that divine wisdom which presided over its composition. On this ground, it should seem that presbyters and deacons, if a comparison is to be instituted between the three orders, are more essential to the Church than bishops, inasmuch as Scripture records the apostolic institution of the former more distinctly than it does that of the latter.”—Pp. 431-433.

The third book treats of the Christian ministry, and it is divided into two chapters, the first on “the origin and perpetuation of the ministerial functions,” and the second on “the powers of the clergy.” Under the first of these heads he discusses the subjects of apostolical succession and of ordination, and establishes from Scripture the views held upon these subjects by the great body of the Reformers.

He is very successful in applying the principles previously established about the idea of the Church to the exposition of the right relation between the Church and the ministry, and in applying this again in bringing out the true place and influence of a visible succession, and of ordination to the office of the ministry. The following passages set forth sound and important views upon these points:—

“Thus far there is Scriptural ground for the doctrine of a ministerial, and, therefore, an apostolical, succession, the Apostles being, as all admit, the first link in the chain: and thus far, therefore, there is no controversy between Protestants and their opponents. The essential differences lie deeper:—they relate to the inner

constitution and origin of the New Testament ministry as contrasted with that of the Law: on which point the theory propounded by the Romish formularies appears to be entirely at variance with the statements of Scripture.

"Romanism, as we have seen, true to its general conception of the Church, considers the Christian ministry in the light of a positive institution, delivered in a set form from without, and placed over, instead of emanating from, the Christian body: its connection with the Church being not natural but positive, or a matter of law. Very different is the light in which Scripture teaches us to regard it. In order to understand better the relation in which, according to Scripture, the ministry of the Church stands to the Church itself, we must recur for a moment to the primary idea of the latter, as expounded in a former part of this work. A Christian Church is, according to the idea, a congregation of faithful or believing men, sanctified by the Spirit of God. Upon this general idea of the Church, as a community inwardly constituted by the Spirit, we must now engraft the further one, so vividly set forth in St. Paul's epistles—viz., that each Church, like the mystical body of Christ itself, is a living organization, or a whole composed of different parts with different functions, by the combination of which organic unity is effected."—Pp. 543-544.

"Now in a religious society of this kind, having its true differentia within, or in the presence of the Holy Spirit, whose ordinary influences are participated by all its members, it would be natural to expect that the diversities of function, or of office, which are necessary to its wellbeing, should follow the character of the society itself, and, instead of being imposed from without in the form of a literal prescription, should spring from within, and emanate directly from the same divine Spirit whose quickening influences pervade the whole mass. And so, in fact, it was divinely provided."—Pp. 544, 545.

"From these remarks the points in which the Romish theory of the origin and perpetuation of the ministry diverges from the view presented in Scripture will be evident. Instead of the ministry being, in the first instance, a positive institution, coming to the Church from without, and, as it were, placed over it, it is a function of the Church itself, springs up from within the sacred enclosure, and, in its primary form, or before it is anything else, is a spiritual power flowing directly from Christ. The ministry does not, as Rome teaches, sustain the Church, but the Church sustains the ministry. The Church is supposed to be in existence, as a congregation of believers, sanctified by the Spirit of God: *within the Church* Christ, its divine Head, raises up, by the outpouring of spiritual gifts, its natural ministry, which then passes into a formal one; raises up, that is, men divinely qualified to teach, exhort, govern, and in other ways edify their brethren. Whether the same men as yet bear formal offices in the Church or not is comparatively immaterial; the possession of the gift is their true warrant for exercising it. The formal ministry, which was itself natural before it was formal, must not suppress the existing natural one:—'quench not

the Spirit, despise not prophesyings.' The single exception to this divinely appointed order, that of the Apostles themselves, who, no doubt, were given to the Church from without, is an additional proof, if any were needed, that their office was but a temporary one, instituted for the purpose of organizing the visible Church, but not intended to form a permanent part of its organization: it would not have been suitable that an order of ministers, whose special office it was to mould the polity of the Church into its appointed shape, should spring from the bosom of the Church itself. The Apostolate, therefore, and it alone of the ecclesiastical offices mentioned in the New Testament, was instituted before the Church came into existence, and stood related to the Church as an external authority. Moreover, they whom Christ thus endows with gifts for the ministry are supposed to be partakers of the common life of the Church; and extraordinary spiritual endowments always appear grafted upon the stock of a living faith. For divine wisdom, knowledge, or illumination are possessed only by the sanctified in heart, and the teachers of the Church must be themselves taught of God. 'Apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers' are members, as well as ministers, of the body of Christ: they are of the Church before they become its instructors and rulers. Hence, as might be expected, no such notion is found in the New Testament as that of grace to qualify for sacerdotal functions, distinct from, and independent of, the grace common to all Christians; or that the *divine* vocation to the ministry is a thing morally indifferent, possessed, if only the legitimate outward call be present, equally by the evil and the good. The inward call of the Spirit to the ministry pre-supposes sanctification by the same Spirit."—Pp. 560-562.

"The conclusions to which the inspired testimony leads us on the subject under discussion may be briefly summed up thus: the ministry of the Church, in all that appertains to its essence, is the direct gift of Christ, to whom alone it properly belongs to perpetuate the succession of pastors: and in its primary state, or as it comes from Christ, it is not an external institution, but a spiritual power emanating from the bosom of the Church itself; it roots in the Church, and has no existence independently thereof. Along with the general outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost, or rather as a constituent part of it, the ministerial gifts were given: they formed an element innate and natural of the spiritual constitution of the Christian body: they existed, and were exercised, before any positive institution of ministerial offices took place. To assume a fixed outward form, and become identified with a separate order of men, is a secondary, though necessary, process. Thus between the idea of the Church and that of its ministry, a perfect correspondence exists: the latter is homogeneous with the former. As a church is first a congregation of sanctified believers, and then an organized society, so the ministry is, in the first instance, a spiritual power, and then an office transmitted in a visible line of succession. In short, the natural ministry is prior, in order of time, to the positive, and constitutes the true

basis thereof. Romanism reverses the order, and makes the ministry positive before it is natural. By the expression 'natural ministry' is meant simply, that wherever there is a church of Christ, there will be found in it, not as a superadded endowment, but as an inherent property, Christians spiritually qualified to edify their brethren; and who, whether they ever form part of the positive order or not, constitute the true clerisy of the Church. This is the only true sense in which the Christian ministry can be said to be of *divine* institution; and in this sense it is so.

"On the other hand, the positive ministry, or visible line of succession, is the ministry in its human, its ecclesiastical, aspect; the ministry, not as it comes from Christ, but as it is constituted mediately by the Church. Hence the positive is ever but an inadequate representation of the true ministry: it partakes of the imperfection which belongs to the Church itself in its visible aspect. For though the general assistance of the Spirit is promised to the elders, or bishop, in the work of 'trying the spirits,' or pronouncing upon the fitness of those who desire the office of a bishop, so that we may believe that the true and the positive ministry will, to a great extent, be coincident, yet, since infallibility in the exercise of this function is not secured, mistakes will from time to time occur; some whom Christ has not called will gain admission to the sacred office, and others, to whom He has given the necessary spiritual endowments, will be excluded therefrom. The case will be here exactly the same as with the Church itself: as the visible church, though it ought to be identical with the true, is never actually so in fact, so the positive succession is never actually identical with the true ministry. The approximation, however, to identity between the two may be continually progressive, and does, in fact, become closer in proportion as by persecution from without, and the energy of discipline within, the visible church becomes more and more one with the mystical body of Christ; the ministry approaching its ideal *pari passu* with the Church itself."—Pp. 581-673.

"To sum up briefly:—the Protestant admits that the ministerial commission was intended to be perpetuated in an uninterrupted visible succession from the Apostles, and that where such a succession exists, the ministry is in its proper normal state: but he cannot admit that the true essence of the ministry lies in the visible succession, any more than he can admit that the true essence of the Church lies in its ritual or polity; and consequently he does not venture to pronounce those churches which, from whatever cause, have lost the succession, to be without a legitimate ministry or efficacious sacraments. The Protestant impugns neither the fact nor the (general) necessity of the visible succession; while the Romanist would hardly maintain that nothing enters into the idea of a minister of the New Testament save the outward commission; the difference is, that the former lays more stress upon the inward preparation of the heart, which is the gift of God; the latter upon the external vocation, which comes from man: just as, to recur to the opposite conceptions which they entertain of the Church itself, the Protes-

tant regards the living faith wrought in the hearts of Christians by the Holy Ghost as the specific difference of the body of Christ, while the Romanist assigns the same place to its external characteristics."—Pp. 579, 580.

The chapter on the powers of the clergy is divided into two sections. The object of the first is to prove that "Christian ministers are not lords over God's heritage," and of the second, "that Christian ministers are not priests." We need scarcely say that he establishes conclusively from Scripture these two important positions, and thus overturns the hierarchical and sacerdotal principles, as they have been generally held by Romanists and High Church prelatists. In establishing the position that ministers are not lords over God's heritage, he lays down and proves this doctrine, that "the proper adjustment of lay and clerical influence depends upon the observance of three rules, 1st, free admission of the laity (meaning by this term all who are not ministers or pastors) to the deliberative assemblies of the Church; 2d, the consent of the laity to the local settlement of pastors; and, 3d, the concurrence of the laity to the exercise of discipline."

In establishing the position that Christian ministers are not priests, Mr. Litton has a good opportunity of explaining and applying his sound Scriptural views of the substance of theology, and he does not fail to improve it. We have room for only a short extract on this subject:—

"Protestantism rejects the dogma of a human priesthood on the same ground on which apostolic Christianity does so. When the reformed confessions enunciate, as the article of a falling or standing Church, that 'we are justified by faith only,' they intend not only to express, as has been already remarked, the inwardness of a justified state, or the fact that a conscious reliance upon the Saviour's merits, and not an external act of the Church, is the instrument of justification, but to affirm further that, by this conscious act of faith, the believer is at once, and without the intervention of any human mediator, made partaker of the saving efficacy of Christ's death. Faith connects us with the priestly office of Christ, both in its propitiatory and in its intercessory aspect; through Him directly and not mediately—"the new and living way"—we draw near to God and enter the most holy place. Wherever justification by faith is held in its true Protestant sense, the doctrine of a human priesthood becomes a useless excrescence, and falls off of itself; for what need can he feel of a human mediator who already enjoys fellowship with God in and through Christ? Hence is to be explained the peculiar vehemence with which Romish writers have ever assailed this doctrine, and the misrepresentations to which in their hands it has been subject. The assailants may in many cases be

too well acquainted with the writings of the reformers not to know that solifidianism, so far as the word expresses a tendency to laxity of practice, is as earnestly repudiated by the latter as by themselves: the animosity exhibited proceeds from a different source; and the Lutheran doctrine of justification is assailed not so much because it is thought dangerous to morality, as because it robs the Church—that is, the clerical order—of its assumed priestly character. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ.* As the dogma of the corporate life makes the Church, not Christ, the author of spiritual life, so the doctrine of a human priesthood under the Gospel makes the clergy the arbiters of the Christian's destiny: for such surely they are to whom is given the power of barring, or opening, as they please, access to God. With an instinct which never errs, the advocate of the tridentine system feels that justification by faith, by which is simply meant that Christ in his priestly office is *present* instead of being represented by a sacerdotal order, is out of place in their doctrinal structure, and must either remain to mar its symmetry, or be expelled from it.

"And this leads us to remark, in conclusion, that the sacerdotal principle may be actively at work where Romanism is not formally professed. Wherever statements are put forth to the effect that the Church is the representative of Christ upon earth—or, as Moehler expresses it, the perpetual incarnation of the Son of God—we have reason to suspect its existence."—Pp. 652, 653.

The work concludes with the following admirable exposure of the Popish and Tractarian notion of the Church being Christ's representative:—

"In no respect can the Church be properly said to be the representative of Christ upon earth. For this is equivalent to saying that Christ having accomplished the work of redemption and ascended into heaven, has withdrawn from the active administration of the kingdom of God upon earth, having previously delegated the authority belonging to him to a priestly caste, the representatives of his representative, through which alone He ordinarily communicates with His people. A more unscriptural notion cannot be conceived. Christ has not withdrawn from His Church, or delegated to its pastors his own incommunicable powers. '*Vicarius est absentis, Christus est præsens.*' In His own proper person, indeed, He is no longer present upon earth, but in His place the Comforter has come, and where the Spirit of Christ is, there is Christ himself. The Holy Spirit is the only real representative or vicar of Christ upon earth. By the exercise of his kingly power, Christ orders and disposes all things for the welfare of His people; by His Word and His Spirit He discharges amongst them His prophetic office; and if in His sacerdotal character—that is, as God and man united in one Person—He is at the right hand of God (the exercise of this office upon earth being incompatible with the nature of the Christian dispensation), yet, inasmuch as direct access to Him,

as the perpetual High Priest of His Church, is opened to every Christian, He is virtually present also in His priestly function; for to say that all Christians are everywhere present to Christ, is equivalent to saying that Christ is everywhere present to them; the Deity of our High Priest renders Him omnipresent.

"That the vicarious theory is incompatible with the hearty recognition of this great truth of Christ's presence amongst His people, is too evident to permit us to entertain any doubts upon the point. Experience has amply proved that where the Church is regarded as the impersonation of Christ upon earth, the Sun of Righteousness speedily disappears behind the intervening body, and His life-giving beams are intercepted. The Church in every point becomes the proximate object of view, and the real source of salvation. If Christ is still supposed to work, it is only indirectly through the Church. Hence it is that what Protestants mean by faith can find no place in the Church theory. Faith, according to the teaching of the reformed Churches, is a conscious reliance upon a present Person; but in the Church system the divine Person who is the proper object of faith is not present; the Church occupies His place, and the demand that we rely upon the Church in the same sense as we should upon Christ himself has not yet been made even by the theologians of Trent. The ingenious reasonings by which it is sometimes attempted to be proved that by justifying faith our Lord and St. Paul mean, an intellectual belief of the doctrines of Christianity, or the Christian religion itself, or the whole congeries of Christian virtues,—any thing, in short, but what it does actually mean in Scripture,—viz., such an acceptance of the word of promise as leads to trust in a Person—are all prompted by the secret consciousness, that the Person upon whom faith should fix is withdrawn from view, nothing being left in His place but the dreary abstraction of the church."—Pp. 655-657.

We greatly admire the ability, the candour, and the boldness, with which Mr. Litton has defended important Protestant and evangelical truths. We regard his work as fitted to be extremely useful, as not unworthy, indeed, to take its place beside Mr. Goode's "*Divine Rule of Faith and Practice.*" He will probably incur the displeasure even of many of his brethren in the Church of England who are not High Churchmen, by the frankness with which he has given up some points which ordinary Episcopalian controversialists are accustomed to defend. But he has maintained no position which, so far as we know, is inconsistent with anything to which the Church of England requires the assent of her members, nothing but what has been maintained before by some of her most eminent divines. It is indeed interesting and instructive to notice that a large proportion of those divines of the Church of England who have been the

most formidable opponents of Popery, have also been the most liberal in their concessions on those very topics which Mr. Litton has discussed, such as Jewell, Whittaker, Reynolds, Morton, Field, Ussher, Stillington, and Burnet.

ART. VI.—1. *Essays written in the intervals of Business.* 5th Edition.

2. *The Claims of Labour. An Essay on the Duties of Employers to Employed.* With additional Essay. 2d Edition.

3. *Friends in Council. A Series of Readings and Discourses thereon.* 2 Vols. New Edition.

4. *Companions of my Solitude.* 3d Edition.

5. *The Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen;—being a Narrative of the Principal Events which led to Negro Slavery in the West Indies and America.* Vols. I. & II.

6. *King Henry the Second—an Historical Drama.*

7. *Catherine Douglas—a Tragedy.*

THE above form a goodly number of volumes—all bearing obvious traces of the same gentle yet masterly hand. They are very diverse in their subjects; but the most important of them are in a literary respect closely associated, being, as their title for the most part bears, "Essays." It is as an Essayist undoubtedly that their author claims significance and consideration. We are grateful to him, too, for his other labours. "Henry the Second," and "Catherine Douglas," are pleasing and skilful dramatic studies, abounding in quiet touches of power and many felicities of expression; but they do not manifest the vivid and creative genius which alone could purchase for them immortality, and crown their author with the laurel wreath.

The historical work entitled the "Conquerors of the New World and their Bondsmen,"—the second volume of which has just appeared—might by itself have claimed, as it deserves, our special notice. It is, we think, a luminous and graphic narrative—aiming at no striking breadth of delineation or powerful variety of portraiture—but sweet and softly-flowing, and pictured here and there with a quaint, rich pencil. Still, with all its unobtrusive excellence, it would not have won distinction for its author. His name,* in its connexion, we feel

might never have been inquired after. But there are few of our readers, we should think, who have not felt an interest in the author of "Friends in Council," and "Companions of my Solitude," to whom the rare beauty of these works has not brought an impression of literary skill inimitable within its range. It is not merely, however, from their peculiarly literary merits that we now propose devoting a few pages to them. These have been already recognised on all hands. But we are anxious also to indicate some progressive aspects of our literature, of which they seem to us significant.

Every one is familiar with the character of the "Essays" of the last century. What unfeigned delight have the pages of the "Tatler," the "Spectator," and their associates imparted! What pleasing reminiscences do they recall! Their gossipy elegance, ingenious talk, bright and playful humour—their chastened and dainty and religious eloquence at times—whom have they not charmed! There is not much in our present Literature that can cope with them in these respects. And yet how few are there who do not now feel the strange want of *vital human interest* in those fine essays—who do not, amid all their glancing polish and exquisite *savoir faire*, desiderate any genuine depth and earnestness, and, in a word, insight! How elaborately shallow do most of their criticisms, and almost all their philosophy, now appear! And then among the numerous trim and dressed figures that move across the page—the crowds of Belindas and Celindas and Eugénias—how little of real life is there, we mean of honest, natural life;—for of certain aspects of life, of the pleasantries and follies of the "town," &c., we have enough,—and get a peep even into the "good, old" English country life in Sir Roger de Coverley. But of man, *as he is*, struggling amid actual toils and duties—of human hearts beating under wrong, darkened with earnest sorrow, or gay with leaping joy—of Life, save at its two extremes of fluttering Comedy or pompous Tragedy, how little do we find. We can never fancy ourselves looking at the real play of human affections, of living interests, in those Essays. We can

severingly he has himself withheld it. He probably thinks, and is quite entitled to think, that it is the character of his works and not the name attached to them that mainly concerns the public. Other reasons, too, obvious enough from the qualities displayed in his works, we can imagine for his anonymousness. But the matter is so much his own, we need not here meddle with it. To those who may be curious, however, we whisper no secret, as we betray no confidence, and mean all honour, when we associate the name of Arthur Helps with works so full of goodness and truth.

* The name of the author cannot be said to be any longer a matter of concealment, however per-

never get at the heart of that eighteenth century existence, if indeed it had any heart at all. All seems to move in idle and flimsy costume, or in correct and decorous buckram. It is either coffeehouse Dilettantism, or "Blair's Sermons."

Now in a great deal of our present Literature, and eminently so in the Essays before us, it is peculiarly the deep and intelligent *human interest* pervading them which gives them significance. Human life as it is about us, burdened and tempted, and yet with the lustre of divine dignity around it and of divine duty before it—this is a feature that comes out upon us continually from the pages of our author. With so many charms, this is to us their deepest charm. You are conscious that you are holding converse with a man who feels profoundly for his fellow-men, with whom life is neither a mere farce nor a mere solemnity, but a great and sacred reality—a mingled drama of intellect, passion, and affection—of duty and recreation—of gladness and tears. It is this vivid sense of the *reality of life*, and its grand meaning in all relations, which makes him look with so saddened and yet so hopeful a gaze on its abuses, in so many forms of social debasement and misery. It is this which inspires him with such a deep enthusiasm in behalf of the oppressed and unhappy of all classes. It is this, we should imagine, which, betraying itself fully in his first comparatively slender work, has been the highest motive and guide of all his literary labours.

And it is this spirit of *human* sympathy, of deep yearning over the physical and spiritual improvement (two things more intimately allied than many fancy) of the race, that is to us the most cheering of all present aspects of our Literature. It is undoubtedly as thus linking itself to the progress of Humanity, and working in the great cause of its purification and happiness, and not merely as a dilettante Recreation or a grave moral School-mistress, that Literature will ever win for itself the position which it claims, and vindicate its heaven-appointed mission. There is a noble field before it in this way—a field in which, while leaving the pulpit to its own work, it may yet tread closely on its function. The latter is apt to expend its strength perhaps too exclusively in a region of dogmata, which however momentous and influential, do not readily mingle themselves with the every-day employments and emotions of human life. In expounding the divine Truth above us, it has been apt to forget the divine Significance in us and around us everywhere. It is the special province of Literature to set forth

and vindicate this Significance—to point out the infinite beauty of all Nature's aspects, the infinite grandeur of all human relations and obligations,—and thus in some sort, too, to be a light to the feet and a lamp to the path, amid the many perplexities, and even the solemn crises of our earthly lot. It is surely impossible to turn a frank and open eye on Nature, with all its harmonious hints of a divine meaning—with all its ripe and sweet lessons, dropping thick as blossoms in a May wind: still less on human Life with all its depths of unfathomed tenderness—its melodies of passion—its most homely joys and most common sorrows, without gathering endless instruction which intimately and practically concerns every man, and which may largely help and bless him. It is the part of Literature to minister at this lower altar of divine Truth, to serve in this outer sanctuary of the divine Glory; and just then most fitly will it fulfil its mission when it most perfectly does this—neither forgetting its priestly dignity and becoming the tool of mere worldly interest, nor yet aspiring to usurp the function of a higher Priesthood, and interpret all needful Truth for Humanity.

In connexion with the vital human interest animating the works of our author, and, in fact, constituting just another aspect of the same quality, is their intense and pervading religiousness. Looking upon human Life, as he does, with so profound and sympathetic an insight, as encompassed everywhere with the light of Truth and the infinite bearings of Duty, he could not fail to write in a Christian spirit, and rise often as he does into a grand religious tone. We have been even awe struck in one or two places at the penetrating and vivid glance which he casts upon the depths of Christian duty,—the vastly solemn import which, with such a clear Christian intelligence, he reads in the most ordinary relations. How impressive the following, for example,—“You who have but a few dependents, or, perhaps, but one drudge, dependent upon you, whether as servant, apprentice, or hired labourer, do not think that you have not an ample opportunity for exercising the duties of an employer of labour. Do not suppose that these duties belong to the great manufacturer, with the population of a small town in his own factory, and that you have nothing to do with them. *The Searcher of all hearts may make as ample a trial of you in your conduct to one poor dependent as of the man who is appointed to lead armies and administer provinces. Nay, your treatment of some animal entrusted to your care may be a history as significant for you as the chronicles of kings*

for them. The moral experiments of the world may be tried with the smallest quantities."—"The Claims of Labour," p. 28. One may read volumes of professed Christian Literature, innumerable sermons, without meeting in them a touch of Christian truth so deep and hitting as this. And it is the same quiet yet keen and pervasive Christian spirit which breathes in all the essays of our author. The spirit is there, as a delicate and searching aroma, shedding a fragrance on all his work, mingling with it as an embalming and purifying essence. You could not well tell what special doctrines the author believes, but you *feel* that he is a Christian, for there is in all his writings the impress of Christian Truth and Purity and Faith. There is at once such an acutely comprehensive and mildly loving intuition of all human responsibilities—such a lofty vindication of the right, and yet such a tender and trustful pity towards the erring—such a calm sustaining charity—the meek eye of Hope looking out beyond his darkest pictures, of our present social degradation,—that you feel that Christianity lives here more brightly and happily than in many writings expressly devoted to its teaching.

We need not say with what peculiar satisfaction we of the *North British Review* must regard works such as those before us in this point of view. They represent in the best form some of the qualities by which we desire to see our Literature marked. Never, we believe, does Christianity appear so truly divine, or Literature shine with so worthy and enduring a lustre, as when thus wedded. Works such as these,—not professedly religious, but treating of common subjects in a truly Christian spirit, (the aspiration of the devoted Arnold,)—not expositions in any express form of the relations of common duty to Christianity, but shewing how all the deepest reaches of the one naturally run into the other, and concentrate there,—are worth, in our opinion, many elaborate apologies. The latter may or may not convince the intellect, but the former go right to the heart, with many home-touches of irresistible power. You see that Christianity is not only a noble and beautiful thing, but something so true and real that every bearing of human Life only finds its right and adequate meaning in it—that the worth of human labour and the beauty of human affection—the divinity that is everywhere in man, yet everywhere obscured in him, only comes forth into living lustre and harmonious strength in the light of that higher Divinity which came down from above to draw all men unto it.

The next most general characteristic of

our author's work is one which we may term their Catholicity. We have seldom read any works marked by a more comprehensive insight. Widely free and varied in the range of their topics, it is yet never any single point or aspect of them merely that is discussed; but, like a man whose life has been one of patient observation and reflectiveness—the author, often in a very few brief touches glances at all sides of a subject, brings into view their mutual adaptations and compensatory meanings, and leaves you pleased and satisfied just because of the obvious fairness and balanced discrimination with which he has set all before you. This is a great virtue in a writer—the more to be prized that it is so seldom found. There is an overbearing tendency in most minds to contemplate only certain aspects of a subject, to be for ever aiming at an artificial consistency of view. Nay, a man's intellectual ability is often reckoned just as he forms with decision, and carries forward with unbending strictness, given principles on all subjects. A hesitating acknowledgment of the strength of opposing arguments, of the value and justice of what may be said on the *other side* of almost every question, is considered an evidence of mental incapacity, or at the best of mere sentimental epicureanism. Now, while there may be truth in the idea that this characteristic is apt to be allied to delicacy rather than strength of the intellectual faculty, it is yet, we think, undeniable that the highest mind is not that which seizes with logical directness and mere firmness of grasp on certain points of a subject, and aims to bring all others into rigid conformity with them, which settles it, in short, in straight, arbitrary, dogmatic fashion,—but that rather which, by the help of a quiet and loving intuition, sees or endeavours to see, all points of a subject—how complex and manifold it is, how incapable of being taken up in any mere formula, and expressed, in all its meaning, therein.

The fact is, the more we study Nature, and the more we learn of Truth, in all relations, the more outreaching and logically incomprehensible are they found to be. They stretch away into bearings and multiply into combinations which the intellect in vain essays to hold. It is ever only the Newtonian story of gathering a few pebbles on the shore of a boundless sea. All goes to falsify the proud old *dictum*, that "man is the measure of things," and to teach him that he must accept many things as they are, and because they are, without being able to say *how* or *why* they are. They are for ever breaking, with the full force of nature, the withes of formula in which he glories to

bind them. Now, the more a man opens his mind to all this,—and he will do so the more just the more genuine and truth-loving he becomes—the less will he aim at abstract and scientific conclusiveness on all subjects. He will see that Truth everywhere is many sided—not a Proteus, indeed, changing its shapes, so that what is truth to-day may be a lie to-morrow; but rather, (if we may venture on a comparison,) like a landscape, of endlessly varied and multiform hue and aspect—here glancing in sunshine, and there lying in masses of shifting and mysterious shadow—here running forth in breezy uplands, and green and quiet resting-places, and there into dark hollows and impenetrable forests. It is the same glorious Nature ever, but ever moving with the restless freedom and grace of life. And all truth is thus *living*—waiting in its beauty to be wooed—in its grandeur to be worshipped, but scorning to be bound in the trammels of an unequal yoke with the mere postulates of man's understanding. She is content to be the mistress of all his fairest imaginings and brightest aspirations, and holiest dreams, but she will not become his wife for entire possession and fixed control.

The man who knows this cannot be a dogmatist, nor yet a sectarian, using these terms in their very widest signification. He will at once be too modest and too just. Loving Truth for her own sake—wrapped in the contemplation of her ideal and transcending beauty, he will see vividly the imperfection of the various forms in which she is presented to him, or (which amounts to the same thing) he will see how her living image is distributed more or less in all such forms, and his soul will shrink therefore from that abstract decisiveness which gives itself up to one form, and can see no good in others. He cannot help seeing the good all around him, and loving it wherever he sees it. He will be fond of viewing things not so much as they appear in the region of bare argument—of hard intellectualism, but as they exist in Life—as concrete realities, with all the limitations and compromises which Life and Reality everywhere assume—“where nothing is tied up neatly, but all is odds and ends, where the doctrine of compensation enters largely,—where there is no third volume to make things straight.”* This is no doubt a spirit which, like every other, may be carried too far—which may degenerate into a mere eclectic vanity, or soft indifference: but apart from abuse, it is, we think, a beautiful, and a healthful, and happy spirit—a spirit really likely to com-

pass more truth than a more aspiring and intellectual one. It is, at least, eminently the spirit of our author—characterizing largely his treatment of every subject—leaving it often, as might be expected, fragmentary and incomplete, (in a logical sense,) but never unfair or unsatisfactory—casting on all his works a smooth, calm, lustrous clearness, if never flooding them with intense bursts of light, carrying rapid and resistless conviction to the mind.

The other intellectual qualities of our author, which chiefly deserve notice, are his shrewd turn of worldly observation, condensing itself sometimes into very pithy and memorable expressions, and his light and playful humour. It is obvious that he has seen much of the world, and marked its ways well. This it is, perhaps, which has strengthened in him that tolerant catholic tendency of which we have spoken. This it is, at least, which gives so much practical value to many of his views. You see at once that he is no mere theorist, dealing with difficult and complex social problems; but a man familiar with details—conversant with practicalities—and whose proposals you do not, therefore, at once turn away from, as devout imaginations, but give your earnest consideration as likely and tangible issues. His humour is of that graceful, lambent kind which he has himself described,* in speaking of an old college friend, never coruscating in bursting flashes, but “lighting up every topic with grace and variety, and hurting nobody.” It is eminently true of it, as indeed of all its pervading excellencies, as a writer, that you cannot often carry away anything, and give it as a specimen of the rest. It seems comparatively poor and trifling when separated from the continuity in which it occurred; yet, read it again in its place, and the same bright and felicitous effect comes upon you. It will not gather up in bouquets to impress and dazzle, but it is everywhere fair and gay, waving on its own green stalk. “A paulful of water from any river will no more give a notion of its beauty” than a quotation will bring before you that of the gentle and gladsome flow of his wit. It is a genial element through the whole—a playful gleam flitting in streaks of graceful and ever-vanishing beauty.

The style of the author is of the same quiet and happy order—the same diffused excellence which mark his genius throughout. He works, from the repose of a well-trained mind, in clear and graceful language. His periods run on with undeviating smooth-

* “Friends in Council,” vol i., p. 97.

* “Friends in Council,” p. 329.

ness and facility. You never need to turn back and gather in the drift of his meaning from amid a complication of clauses, or a disorderly exuberance of language. You are always up to it, and carried along by it, if you read with the most ordinary attention. It is impossible to conceive any works more free from the characteristic defects of the writing of the present day—tumidity, vehemence, mysticism. He is everywhere clear, free, calm, temperate—too uniformly *level*, perhaps. Even in his most impressive passages, there is scarcely ever any hurry,—or sweep,—or rapid, bold grouping. There may be generally a deficiency of passion and force,—although it is really preposterous to make such demands upon a writer, and suppose that he can combine all the excellencies of composition. He is no more to be blamed for not doing so, than a flower is to be charged with not being at once gorgeous and meekly beautiful. We cannot have,—save in some rare and surpassing instances,—quietness and sweetness, and musical softness, united with energy, and boldness, and grandeur. Our author's predominant qualities are all of the former kind.

Yet it would be a great mistake to judge him at all tame and spiritless. No one could be less so. There is a vital pulse beating in his softest and most level utterances. There is a heartiness beaming all throughout—a chastened glow warming and animating every page. In this respect, too, he contrasts, we think, favourably with the Essayists of the last century. Rivalling them in perspicuity, (their unfailing merit,) approaching them, if no more, in neatness and polish of diction, he excels them in variety and freedom. Their uniform elegance is beautiful, but cold and often stately. He moves with a frank and animated gesture—with a careless, yet never infelicitous ease. And if his humour, as we have described it, be less exquisite and flavorful than theirs, it is yet ever delicate, and draws perhaps a deeper power from the deep vein of seriousness—of earnest, and even mournful thoughtfulness, that is clearly seen under all its variety of manifestations, to be the main ingredient of the author's mind. His characteristic composure, in short, is not a mere constitutional quality—the natural expression of a naturally placid nature, but obviously, and as he has himself indeed indicated, the chosen mode in which he has aimed artistically to clothe his thoughts. He has wrought himself to peacefulness through struggle and earnest endeavour, believing in his own words, that "violence is always loss." He has too

broad and loving an eye, and too keen a sense of truth, to yield to exaggerations even in style. The same sensitiveness, and grace, and nice discrimination which mark his intellectual apprehension throughout, rule also his language, and give it its delightfulness and felicity. And if it sometimes sinks even to baldness, when the theme is trite and commonplace, it yet often rises into passages of the most rich and picturesque beauty, or of the sweetest and most touching tenderness.

His first publication at the head of our list is a thin little volume, entitled, "Essays written in the Intervals of Business," and now in its fifth edition. It does not demand much comment from us. Full of the same observant shrewdness, gentle seriousness, and genial penetration, which distinguish his other works, these and all the qualities of the author are yet less ripely developed in it. There is, if we may say so, with all respect, a thinness in the intellectual matter as well as in the external appearance of the volume. The second part, which treats continuously of business, its duties and responsibilities, interested us but little, probably because it addressed us so remotely, but also in a considerable measure from a feeling that much of the advice given is too minute and *pedantic*, if we may use an expression than which nothing is less applicable to our author generally. The rules laid down for the proper and successful "transaction of business" are obviously of a valuable and important character; but it is somehow too much as if it were the schoolmaster taking us to task,—a much needed and very reasonable tuition we do not doubt; but the lessons are withal somewhat tedious, and the demand on our attentions somewhat irksome.

"The Claims of Labour," with the additional essay "On the Means of Improving the Health of the Labouring Classes," is in every respect a more notable production. Dealing with a subject of such momentous consequence, it everywhere displays a larger grasp, and a fuller and more robust style. It is throughout, in fact, a volume of the deepest interest, conceived and executed in the finest spirit. We could not imagine the subject set forth in a way more likely to win attention from the reluctant, and to inspire with intelligent zeal and hopefulness those whose attention is already aroused. The vast importance of the subject it is certainly impossible to overrate; and it is a matter of thankfulness that there are at length so many high minds among us earnestly directing their thoughts to it. A better and a brighter time is surely at length coming to the human race, and especially to

the children of toil and poverty—the victims of industrial misrule, when so many warm hearts and noble intelligences are turning with a hitherto unknown earnestness, to the great problem of social wellbeing. To a man, in whom all the faculties of heart and soul are full, who has a mind to see, and a bosom to be touched with the miseries around him, and upon whom has come even some dim sense of the infinite capacities and issues of all human life, it must be the very saddest contemplation, that with all our advancing civilisation—with our vast and ever strengthening resources of science, and art, and wealth, there should remain so black and fearful a shadow to the bright picture—that by the side of all this glittering increase, there should harbour such dreadful sickening masses of human degradation and suffering. We may well ask with our author,—

“What do all these mechanical triumphs come to? It is in vain that you have learned to move with double or treble the velocity of your immediate predecessors: it is in vain that you can shew new modes of luxury or new resources in art. The inquiring historian will give these things their weight, but will nevertheless persevere in asking how the great mass of the people were fed, and clothed, and taught; and whether the improvement in their condition corresponded at all with the improvement of the condition of the middle and upper classes. What a sorry answer any one replying for this age would have to give him. Nor would it be enough, indeed, if we could make a satisfactory reply to his questions about the physical state of the people. We ought to be able to say, that the different orders of society were bound together by links of gratitude and regard; that they were not like layers of various colored sand, but that they formed one solid whole of masonry, each part having its relation of use and beauty to all the others. Certainly, if we look at the matter, we have not much to say for ourselves, unless it be in that dawning of good intentions which I have alluded to before. There is to be found in our metropolis, in our great towns, and even in our rural districts, an extent of squalid misery such as we are almost afraid to give heed to, and which we are glad to forget as soon as we have read or heard of it. It may be that our ancestors endured—it may be that many savage tribes still endure, far more privation than is to be found in the sufferings of our lowest class; but the mind refuses to consider the two states as analogous, and insists upon thinking that the state of physical and moral degradation often found amongst our working classes, with the arabesque of splendour and luxury which surrounds it, as a more shocking thing to contemplate than a passing scarcity of provisions, endured by a wandering horde of savage men sunk in equal barbarism. When we follow men home who have been co-operating with other civilized men in continuous labor throughout the live-long day, we should not, without experience, expect to find their houses

dreary, comfortless, deformed with filth, such houses as poverty alone could not make. Still less, when we gaze upon some pleasant looking village, fair enough in outward seeming for poets' songs to celebrate, should we expect scarcity of fuel, scantiness of food, prevalence of fever, the healthy huddled together with the sick, decency outraged, and self-respect all gone. And yet such sights, both in town and country, if not of habitual occurrence, are, at any rate, sadly too numerous for us to pass them by as rare and exceptional cases.”—*Claims of Labour*, pp. 3-5.

We cannot pretend to present our readers with any outline of the mode in which our author pursues his subject in either of the conjoined essays before us. He is not given here, nor anywhere, to what may be called strictly systematic treatment. He does not lay down a formal plan, and fill it in rigidly. There are, however, few or no relations of his subject overlooked. He leads you round it all in his own quiet and attractive way, till your interest is thoroughly quickened, and you are fully prepared to enter into the remedial measures which he somewhat specifically proposes. Most earnestly we commend the volume to all who may not yet have read it. It is only a perusal that can give any idea of its impressive truth and beauty.

“Friends in Council” is a more varied and elaborate work than either of its predecessors—forming a series of readings or essays, with conversations upon them interspersed. The readings are on the most varied subjects, and of course of very various interest, but all pleasing and instructive. What may be called the *setting* of the work is to us its most pleasant feature. It takes away altogether the monotony of a mere series of essays and conversations, and imparts to the whole a living interest. The reader comes to feel as it were that he is sharing the companionship and really listening to the talk of “Friends.” The kind and placid old Dunsford—the grave and earnest Milverton—the clever and sarcastic Ellesmere, and the demure and gentle Lucy,—you seem to know them all. With no special effort at portraiture on the part of the author, it is wonderful how vivid is your acquaintance with all the four before you close the book,—with what clear individuality they stand out before you—how you learn to love them all, even the externally cold and captious Ellesmere, whom you yet somehow feel has a warm heart within, folded up and repressed as are its impulses,—how you welcome their next meeting and conversation, and how reluctant you are at length to part with them. It is like leaving off pleasant company and returning to your silent and lonely room.

The work opens with a brief introduction of the "Friends." It is Dunsford who, as professed *editor* of the volumes, introduces the others to us. He is a country clergyman, and has grown old in the discharge of his loving and unostentatious duties. His comparative solitude has long since become dear to him. He would not exchange, probably, for all else the world could give him, the familiar faces of his parishioners, and the aspects of nature on which he has daily gazed, till he has taken them all into his heart, and loves them more than he can tell. He has reminiscences however of bright days of former companionship, of "intellectual society in which he once lived," and he hears, therefore, with gladness, that his "old pupil Milverton has taken a house which had long been vacant" in his neighbourhood. To add to his pleasure, Milverton's college friend Ellesmere, "the great Lawyer," also an old pupil, came on frequent visits "in the course of the autumn."

This was great joy to the kindly tutor, and awakens in him pleasant thoughts of his former intercourse with his pupils. "Milverton and Ellesmere," he says, were his favourite pupils. "Many is the heartache I have had at finding that these boys with all their abilities would do nothing at the university. But it was in vain to urge them. I grieve to say that neither of them had any ambition of the right kind. Once I thought I had stimulated Ellesmere to the proper care and exertion; when to my astonishment and vexation, going into his room about a month before an examination I found that, instead of getting up his subjects like a reasonable man, he was absolutely endeavouring to invent some new method for proving something which had been proved before in a hundred ways. Over this he had wasted two days, and from that moment I saw it was useless to waste any more of my time and patience in urging a scholar so indocile for the beaten path. What tricks he and Milverton used to play me, pretending not to understand my demonstration of some mathematical problem, inventing all manner of subtle difficulties, and declaring they could not go on while these stumbling-blocks lay in their way. But I am getting into college gossip, which may in no way delight my readers. And I am fancying too that Milverton and Ellesmere are the boys they were to me, but I am now the child to them. During the years that I have been quietly living here, they have become versed in the ways of the busy world. And though they never think of asserting their superiority, I feel it and am glad to do so."—(Pp. 2-3.)

The good old man! who does not fancy him, as the soft tears fill his eyes at the re-

membrance of these glad college days, now lying so far behind him, and yet so clear and vivid in his heart.

The "Friends" thus brought into each other's vicinity, arrange for regular meetings at which Milverton reads some essays "which he was at that time writing," and these, with the conversations following, chronicled by Dunsford, constitute the work. "The place where we generally met in fine weather," he says, "was on the lawn before Milverton's house. It was an eminence which commanded a series of valleys sloping towards the sea. And as the sea was not more than nine miles off, it was a matter of frequent speculation with us whether the landscape was bounded by air or water. In the first valley was a little town of red brick houses, with poplars coming up amongst them. The ruins of a castle and some water, which in olden times had been the lake in 'the pleasaunce,' were between us and the town. The clang of an anvil, or the clamour of a horn, or busy wheelwright's sounds, came faintly up to us when the wind was gentle."

Such is the agreeable *setting* of the work, which is never lost sight of. By a few simple touches the *tableau* is preserved, and new life and freshness now and then imparted to it. How simple, yet how effective in this way, for example, the device by which Lucy is introduced and the brief traits which describe her and her mother!—(Pp. 301-3.) And again how vividly real the meeting at the inn and the ride home; Ellesmere's restive mare carrying him beyond reach of his friend's conversation! And then again, the meeting at Cologne, the "City of many Churches," among the great stones of the unfinished Cathedral.

The topics discussed by the Friends in Council are, as we have said, very diversified: some of them hackneyed enough and reminiscent of schoolboy themes: such as "Truth," "Greatness," "Reading," "History." Perhaps, however, there could be no greater proof of the homely freshness of the genius of our *Essayist* than the grace and interest and fine vein of instructiveness often, which he imparts to his treatment of such themes. Of Truth, for instance, he says,—

"Truth needs the wisdom of the serpent as well as the simplicity of the dove. He has gone but a little way in his matter who supposes that it is an easy thing for a man to speak the truth, 'the thing he troweth;' and that it is a natural function which may be filled at once after any lapse of exercise. But, in the first place, the man who would speak the truth, must know what he troweth. To do that, he must have an uncorrupted judgment. By this is not meant a perfect judgment, or even a wise one, but one

which, however it may be biassed, is not bought—is still a judgment. But some people's judgments are so entirely gained over by vanity, selfishness, passion, or inflated prejudices and fancies long indulged in, or they have the habit of looking at everything so carelessly, that they see nothing truly: they cannot interpret the world of reality. And this is the saddest form of lying, 'the lie that sinketh in,' as Bacon says, which becomes part of the character, and goes on eating the rest away. Again, to speak truth, a man must not only have that martial courage which goes out with sound of drum and trumpet to do and suffer great things: but that domestic courage which compels him to utter small-sounding truths in spite of present inconvenience and outraged sensitiveness or sensibility. Then he must not be in any respect a slave to self-interest. Often it seems as if but a little misrepresentation would gain a great good for us; or perhaps we have only to conceal some trifling thing, which if told, might hinder unreasonably, as we think, a profitable bargain. The true man takes care to tell, notwithstanding. When we think that truth interferes at one time or another with all a man's likings, hatings, and wishes, we must admit, I think, that it is the most comprehensive and varied form of self-denial."—Vol. i. pp. 7, 8.

Our author devotes a reading to "Recreation," which is a very favourite subject with him, not only in this, but in his other works. He is most earnest in his advocacy of its worthiness. "Noble work is a noble thing," he says; but then men must have also leisure and play. The notion which would denounce amusement as frivolous almost awakens a touch of wrath in his commonly gentle temper; while our northern love of dullness receives a special blow in passing. For ourselves, we will not plead an arrest of judgment; although here also there is no doubt something to be said on the other side. It must not be forgotten that recreation is in every case relative, and not to be measured by the mere vivacity of its expression. An Anglo-Saxon finds real amusement in ways that seem tedious dullness to a Frenchman or Southern German. Yet it cannot be doubted, that we are not clever at amusing ourselves. There is a want of lightness and grace and easy happiness in our chief modes of employment. "They take their pleasures sadly," according to the saying of old Froissart, "after their fashion." "We need not ask," says our author, "of what nation Froissart was speaking." That this is a flaw in our civilization we firmly believe. There is probably, indeed, in reference to human progress, more noble meaning and high use in the modes of a people's recreation, than even its warmest advocates yet fancy. We agree entirely with our author that—

"The sense of the beautiful, the desire for comprehending nature, the love of personal skill and prowess, are not things implanted in men merely to be absorbed in producing and distributing the objects of our most obvious animal wants. If civilization required this, civilization would be a failure. Still less should we fancy that we are serving the cause of godliness, when we are discouraging recreation. Let us be hearty in our pleasures, as well as in our work, and not think that the gracious Being who has made us so open-hearted to delight, looks with dissatisfaction at our enjoyment, as a hard taskmaster might, who in the glee of his slaves, could see only a hindrance to their profitable working. And with reference to our individual cultivation we may remember that we are not here to promote incalculable quantities of law, physic, or manufactured goods, but to become men: not narrow pedants, but wide-seeing, mind-travelled men. Who are the men of history to be admired most? Those who most things became: who could be weighty in debate, of much device in council, considerate in a sick room, genial at a feast, joyous at a festival, capable of discourse with many minds, large-souled, not to be shrivelled up into any one form, fashion, or temperament. Their contemporaries would have told us that men might have various accomplishments and hearty enjoyments, and not for that be the less effective in business or the less active in benevolence. I distrust the wisdom of asceticism as much as I do that of sensuality—Simeon Stylites no less than Sardanapalus."—Vol. i. pp. 62, 63.

The conversational part of the work is perhaps, in some respects, the most interesting—Ellesmere's liveliness breaking forth in all manner of bright and dashing ways, starting sometimes subtle traces of thought, and Dunsford, with his old fashioned caution, eliciting deeper and more comprehensive views of the subject discussed. With our space filling rapidly, we can only give one brief and imperfect quotation from the "Discourses." An essay has been read on "Unreasonable Claims on Social Affections":—

"*Ellesmere, (clapping his hands.)*—An essay after my own heart: worth tons of soft trash. In general, you are amplifying duties, telling everybody that they are to be so good to every other body. Now, it is as well to let every other body know that he is not to expect all he may fancy from everybody. A man complains that his prosperous friend neglects him, infinitely overrating, in all probability, his claims, and his friend's power of doing anything for him.

"*Dunsford.*—I do not see exactly how to answer all that you or Milverton have said; but I am not prepared, as official people say, to agree with you. I specially disagree with what Milverton has said about love; he leaves much too little power to the will.

"*Milverton.*—I daresay I may have done so.

These are very deep matters, and any one view about them does not exhaust them. I remember C. once saying to me that a man never utters anything without error. He may even think of it rightly; but he cannot bring it out rightly. It turns a little false as it were when it quits the brain and comes into life.

"Ellesmere.—I thought you would soon go over to the soft side. Here, Rollo; there's a good dog. You do not form unreasonable expectations, do you? A very little petting puts you into an ecstasy, and you are much wiser than many a biped who is full of his claims for gratitude and friendship and love; and who is always longing for well-merited rewards to fall into his mouth. Down, dog!

"Milverton.—Poor animal! It little knows that all this sudden notice is only by way of ridiculing us. Why I did not maintain my ground stoutly against Dunsford is, that I am always afraid of pushing moral conclusions too far. Since we have been talking, I think I see more clearly than I did before what I mean to convey by the Essay, namely, that men fall into unreasonable views respecting the affections, from imagining that the general laws of the mind are suspended for the sake of the affections.

"Dunsford.—That seems safer ground, &c.

* * * * *

"Dunsford.—There was another comment I had to make. I think when you speak about the exorbitant demands of neglected merit, you should say more upon the neglect of the just demands of merit.

"Milverton.—I would have the government and the public in general try by all means to understand and reward merit, especially in those matters wherein excellence cannot otherwise meet with large present reward. But to say the truth, I would have this done, not with the view of fostering genius so much as of fulfilling duty. I would say to a minister—It is becoming in you, it is well for the nation to reward, as far as you can, and dignify men of genius; whether you will do them any good, or bring forth more of them, I do not know.

"Ellesmere.—Men of great genius are often such a sensitive race, so apt to be miserable in many other than pecuniary ways, and want of public estimation, that I am not sure that distress and neglect do not take their minds off worse discomforts. It is a kind of grievance too that they like to have.

"Dunsford.—Really, Ellesmere, that is a most unfeeling speech.

"Milverton.—At any rate, it is right for us to know and observe a great man. It is our nature to do so, if we are worth anything. We may put aside the question, whether our honour will do him more good than our neglect. This is a question for him to look to. The world has not yet so largely honoured deserving men in their own time that we can easily pronounce what effect it would have upon them.

"Ellesmere.—Come, Rollo, let us leave the men of sentiment. Oh, you will not go, as your master does not move. Look how he wags his tail, and almost says, 'I should dearly like to have a hunt after the water-rat we saw in the pond the other day; but master is talking philosophy, and requires an intelligent audience.'

These dogs are dear creatures, it must be owned. Come, Milverton, let us have a walk."

We have indicated, but in the slightest manner, what the reader will find in 'Friends in Council;' but we cannot occupy our space with further extracts from it. At the risk of lingering, however, we must still say, that the greater part of the second volume is devoted to the discussion of slavery. The subject is one intensely interesting to the author, and to which he has given much attention. It is treated by him here under the several heads:—1. That slavery is cruel.—2. That slavery is needless.—3. That it is unauthorized.—4. That it is mischievous to the master as well as to the slave.—5. That there are no races in respect to which the preceding propositions do not apply.—6. That slavery can be done away. There is no aspect of the subject overlooked or superficially discussed; and many noble things he says about it in beautiful and pathetic language. We have to notice especially the same wise moderation of tone and balance of judgment which characterize his treatment of the "Claims of Labour." He never denounces merely; but he vindicates and reasons, and expostulates with all the patience and force of one who has observed all the bearings of his subject, made himself familiar with its base horrors and melancholy difficulties, and resolved with a calm earnestness to do what in him lay to help forward human enlightenment and progress regarding it. There is but little hard and pushing argumentation, according to the manner of the author. He reaches his points in the main illustratively, presenting the truth in pictures rather than in formulas to the mind. Yet the effect of the whole, in an argumentative way, is very convincing and satisfactory.

"Companions of my Solitude" is undoubtedly the gem of our author's works. It has, we suppose, introduced him to many readers whom his former works had scarcely reached. It has set all inquiring more who the author was, who could write so pleasantly, whose thoughts were at once such sweet and solemn "Companions," so illuminating and instructive withal. It contains, moreover, all the intellectual and literary characteristics of the author in richer strength and grace, or at least in a more compact and impressive form. There is a mellowness—an autumn ripeness about both the sentiments and style which touches, with a pen-sive softness, the heart, and leaves on it deep and lingering traces of many wise and important lessons. A chastened and lustrous light of humour and fancy, of thoughtful,

playful, and picturesque meditateness is diffused through it, leaving no page unilluminated with quiet meaning, and concentrating itself here and there into the most vivid gleams of truth and the most exquisite touches of beauty. The utmost frankness and sincerity are stamped on it. Its simplicity charms you, while its earnestness solemnizes you. You feel that it has been written from the heart—that it is a brother that speaks to you from the depths of his most sacred convictions, on subjects that may have often lain near to your own thoughts, but which you have never felt so strongly, nor seen so clearly before.

There is no essential connexion in the various topics it embraces. They have a subjective association in the author's mind, as the "spiritual Companions" of his varying moods of solitude; but they do not relate themselves in any direct mode to one another.

They come and go, just as thoughts do come and go; and the light of a pleasant humour, or the tinge of an earnest sadness, plays around them, as it may be, in pure brightness or in softened and changing shadows. The idea of the volume will be best conveyed in the author's own words:—

"When I am in the country," he says, "I live much alone; and as I wander over downs and commons, and through lanes with lofty hedges, many thoughts come into my mind. I find, too, the same ones come again and again, and are spiritual companions. At times they insist upon being with me, and are resolutely intrusive. I think I will describe them, that so I may have more mastery over them. Instead of suffering them to torment me as vague faces, and half-fashioned resemblances, I will make them into distinct pictures, which I can give away or hang up in my room, turning them, if I please, with their faces to the wall; and, in short, be free to do what I like with them. Ellesmere will then be able to deride them at his pleasure, and so they will go through the alembic of sarcasm; Dunsford will have something more to approve or rebuke; Lucy something more to love or to hate. Even my dogs and my trees will be the better for this work, as when it is done they will perhaps have a more disengaged attention from me. Faithful, steadfast creatures, both dogs and trees; how easy and charming is your converse with me compared with the eager, exclusive, anxious way in which the creatures of my own brain, who at least should have some filial love and respect for me, insist upon my attention.

"It was a thoroughly English day to-day, sombre and quiet, the sky coming close to the earth, and everything seeming to be of one colour. I wandered over the downs, not heeding much which way I went, and driven by one set of thoughts which of late have had great hold upon me. I think often of the hopes of the race here, of what is to become of our western civilisation, and what can be made of it.

Others may pursue Science or Art, and I long to do so too; but I cannot help thinking of the state and fortunes of large masses of mankind, and hoping that thought may do something for them. After all my cogitations, my mind generally returns to one thing—the education of the people. For want of general cultivation, how much individual excellence is crippled! Of what avail, for example, is it for any one of us to have surmounted any social error, or any superstition, while his neighbours lie sunk in it. His conduct in reference to them becomes a constant care and burden."—Pp. 1-3.

And so on he goes, from topic to topic, in the most natural and pleasing way. Even, as in actual life, you are scarcely sensible of the transitions, although they are often to the most dissimilar subjects. It is just as your own thoughts have often wandered, as you too have strayed over the fields or by the sheltering hedgerows, and the changing face of nature has drawn you now to thoughts of gladness, and now to thoughts "too deep for tears." It is our old friend Milverton, the reader will observe, that personates the author; and Dunsford, and Ellesmere, and Lucy, in the distance, again make their appearance.

We have already spoken in express terms of the religious tone of the author's mind. This tone is perhaps peculiarly manifested in the "Companions of my Solitude." We see, moreover, that this is no mere mood with the author, but that his mind has been deeply exercised on religious and ecclesiastical questions, especially as they stand at present. His thoughts in his solitude often turn to these:—

"As the shades of evening came in on the woods, my thoughts went away from these simple topics; the *refrain* too,

"Quasi presto se va el placer,"

sounded in my ears again; and I passed on to meditations of like colour to those in the former part of my walk. In addition to the other hindrances I alluded to before, this also must come home to the mind of every man of the present generation—how is he to discern, much more to teach, even in small things, without having clear views or distinct conceptions upon some of the greatest matters—upon religious questions for instance? And yet I suppose it must be tried. Even a man of Goethe's immense industry, and great intellectual resources, feared to throw himself upon the sea of Biblical criticism. But at the same time how poor, timid, and tentative must be all discourse built upon inferior motives. Ah, if we could but discern what is the right way, and the highest way!"—(P. 30.)

Again, with special reference to the Church of England, he says:—

"As I went along I thought of the Church of England, and of what might be its future fortunes. I had just been reading the works of two brothers; last night I had finished an elaborate attack from the Roman Catholic side upon the Anglican Church by one brother; and this morning I had read a very skilful attack upon all present religious systems by another brother. And I thought to myself, the Church of England suffers from both attacks. . . .

"For my own part, it has long appeared to me that our Church stands upon foundations which need more breadth and solidity, both as regards the hold it ought to have on the reason, and on the affection of its members. As to the hold upon the reason: suppose we were taught to study scientifically up to a certain point something that admitted of all the lights of study, and were then called upon to take the rest for granted, not being allowed to use to the uttermost the lights of history and of criticism which had been admitted at first; how very inconclusive the so-called conclusions would appear to us. It would be like placing a young forest tree in a hot-house, and saying, Grow so far, if you can, spread to the uttermost in the space allowed to you, but there is no more room after you have obtained these limits; thenceforward grow inwards or downwards, or wither away. Our Church is too impersonal, if I may use that expression: it belongs too much to books, set creeds, and articles, and not enough to living men: it does not admit easily of those modifications which life requires, and which guard life by adapting it to what it has to bear. Again, as regards affection: how can any, except those who are naturally devout and affectionate, which is not the largest class, have an affectionate regard for anything which presents so cold and formal an appearance as the Church of England! The services are too long; and, for the most part, are surrounded with the most prosaic circumstances. Too many sermons are preached, and yet, after all, too little is made of preaching. The preachers are apt to confine themselves to certain topics which, however really great and solemn, are exhaustible, at least so far as men can tell us aught about them. Order, decency, cleanliness, propriety, and very often good sense are to be seen in full force in Anglican Churches once a week: but there is a deficiency of heartiness.

"The perfection to be aimed at, as it seems to me, and as I have said before, would be a Church with a very simple creed, a very grand ritual, and a useful and devoted priesthood. But these combinations are only in Utopias, Blessed Islands, and other fabulous places; no vessel enters their ports, for they are as yet only in the minds of thoughtful men."—Pp. 231-35.

These extracts are significant enough of our author's religious thoughtfulness. They are significant of more; they express an earnest dissatisfaction, a yearning after something better—something more hearty and congenial than the Church of England as it is, or any other Church presents. It is impossible to help remarking how commonly

expressed a feeling this is in our present Literature. Thinking minds are everywhere astir about religion; and there is in manifold vague forms a groping after higher light and a purer worship. In such a time as ours, something of this sort is indeed apt to become a fashion, and to degenerate into a cant, as unworthy and contemptible as anything on the other side. Yet this ignoble shadow, which stalks beside every movement, must not be allowed to hide the genuine fact which it caricatures. It is there only because a living reality reflects it. And what deep injustice there would be in hinting any doubt of the earnestness of the convictions and aspirations of such men as our author, we need not say. There is no man who is not utterly blind, or utterly uncandid, who can doubt that there is abroad much honest and well-principled dissatisfaction with existing religious phenomena. This is not the place nor the time to point to any higher meaning—any more harmonious solution of religious problems, which all this may indicate for the Church. It is well, however, that the Church should not ignore the *fact*,—but face it. No good can ever come from blindness. Especially the Church must *work* more earnestly, and in all things more Christian-wise.

We must now bid farewell to our author, grateful for the happy hours his books have given us. We could not wish a pleasanter wish for any of our readers who do not know them, than that they should speedily make their acquaintance. The fault will be theirs if they do not love them, and either a strange hardness or a rare merit must be theirs, if they do not profit by them.

ART. VII.—*History of Physical Astronomy from the Earliest Ages to the middle of the Nineteenth Century; comprehending a Detailed Account of the Establishment of the Theory of Gravitation by Newton, and its Development by his successors; with an Exposition of the Progress of Research on all the other subjects of Celestial Physics.* By ROBERT GRANT, F.R.A.S. 8vo, Pp. 672. London, 1852.

ASTRONOMY, the *law of the stars*, has ever been, and ever will be, a subject of the most intense and varied interest—the widest in its range—the most fascinating in its details—the most startling in its conclusions—and the most exciting to the speculative and spiritual nature of man. Carry-

ing us back to primæval times, before the birth of life and reason, its truths are the earliest to be impressed upon the youthful mind; and carrying us forward to the future, when life shall be without end, and reason without error, it would be well were they among the last when the soul wings its way to a happier sphere. A planet has been our birth-place—a star may be our home. Thus associated with our earliest intelligence—and thus related to our final destiny, Astronomy is indeed the universal science, and its laws the laws of the Universe. Embracing at once all that is sidereal as well as all that is sublunary, Astronomy proclaims the same law of force for the most remote as well as for the nearest of the celestial motions. If the law of gravity guides our satellite in its monthly course, it guides also the most distant planet of our system; and if it is thus the law of the Solar System, it must be the law which guides that system round the distant centre about which it is now proved to revolve. The law of gravity is, therefore, the law of the Universe, and with this peculiar character, above all other laws, that it enables us to declare what were the phenomena, and what the position of the heavenly bodies for thousands of years that are past, and to predict the same for thousands of years that are to come. It gives us no information respecting the soil or production of the planets of our system, but it enables us to compute with an accuracy inconceivable the weight and density of matter in the sun, the planets and the satellites, a result which Adam Smith pronounced to be almost “above the reach of human reason and experience.” Nor does it gratify our curiosity respecting the forms of life, intellectual and organic, which doubtless adorn the planetary domains. It is to the telescope alone that we must look for the solution of this great problem—a problem, however, which would not be solved even were it proved that there were no inhabitants in the moon. We are thus left, and probably ever will be left, in the belief, if we choose to believe, that the planet we inhabit, though occupying no peculiar place, and marked with no distinguishing character, is yet the favoured spot from which alone it has pleased the Almighty to promulgate the constitution and the laws of his glorious universe.

By what means and by what men this great work has been accomplished, the historian of astronomy delights to tell us. Placed on an extended plane of hill and dale, of earth and ocean, and viewing the

revolving firmament with its host of sun and moon and stars, the very idea of a system seems to be excluded. Our own earth becomes the centre and the favoured spot of creation, while the orbs that rule the day and the night seem created for our specific use. In travelling, however, from his own observatory, the astronomer finds each horizon descending from his view, and uniting them together, in every direction around him, he is driven to the conclusion that he dwells upon a globe that is round like the luminaries that accompany it. In continuing his studies he finds that all the stars, except a few, are fixed at invariable distances; and the studded firmament thus becomes a scale by which he can measure the motions of the sun, moon, and moveable stars, which change their places in the heavens. In this manner he soon ascertains the apparent motions of the planets, their stations, their retrogradations, and the general character of their movements. By measuring a base line on the sea-shore or on a level plane, he obtains the length of a circular arch or of a degree of the meridian, and thus ascertains the diameter of his own planet; and with this as an element he determines the distance and magnitude of the sun and moon. The motion of the moon round the earth, and of the earth round the sun, display to him the character of that part of the system with which he is more immediately connected—a planet with its satellite revolving round the sun. The periods and relative distances of the other planets, and of the satellites of those that have them are next determined, and the Solar System, with the number and nature of its planets, primary and secondary, is thus revealed to him in all its extent and grandeur.

When the earth is at the two opposite points of its orbit, distant from each other nearly 200 millions of miles, he views the stars with the nicest instruments, and he learns the startling truth that the nearest of them is placed at a distance from his own system almost inconceivable. Unlike the planets, they have from their distance no visible discs, even when highly magnified: and were the earth's annual orbit filled with light, and seen from a fixed star above it, it would appear smaller than the smallest of our planets. By the aid of the telescope the astronomer discovers among the stars double, triple, and multiple systems, in which one or more stars revolve round another, and by the gigantic instrument which Lord Rosse had elevated to the heavens, we desery in the faintest nebulæ groups of stars, and spiral forms of arrangement, indicating

forces of which we know nothing, and on a scale of magnitude which the highest reason will probably never grasp.

We are thus conducted to the almost invisible verge of the universe—to that mysterious bourne beyond which the human eye is too dim to explore, and the human faculties too feeble to apprehend. We ponder over the wondrous scene, and failing to comprehend the infinite in space and time, Reason resigns itself to Faith, and pants for that eternal day under whose sunshine we shall no longer see through a glass darkly, but know even as we are known.

By such means, as we have very imperfectly delineated, has the astronomer sketched, in their true outline, three different systems of worlds,—the system of the earth and moon on which he himself lives, and reasons, and in which alone we know that life exists,—the solar system, including his own and the sidereal systems of stars and nebulae which extend all around, and fill up, as it were, the rest of the universe. To these systems he adds, what he knows little about, the system of the comets, which, for purposes we cannot even conjecture, seems to connect our planetary system with bodies far beyond it.

When these various departments of Astronomy have been separated and studied, and their general character ascertained, the Astronomer has scarcely sounded, and still less explored the depths of his science. He has established the facts, and explained the phenomena of DESCRIPTIVE ASTRONOMY, or what may be called the Natural History of the Heavens. The mathematician and the philosopher now come to his aid, to determine from mechanical principles, the laws which regulate the celestial motions, to compute the changes in the planetary orbits which are produced by their mutual action, and thus to determine with accuracy their periods of revolution, the form and position of their orbits, and the other elements which enable him to compute their places, their phases, their occultations, and their eclipses, at any past or at any future instant. To this branch of the science is given the name of PHYSICAL ASTRONOMY, the subject of the work which we are about to analyze.

A complete history of Physical Astronomy has long been a desideratum in science, not so much for the use of the mathematician, and mechanical philosopher, as for the student and general reader, who require a more popular exposition of the systems of the world than is to be found in the *Principia* of Newton, or in the *Mécanique Céleste* of Laplace. The work of Mr. Grant supplies the desideratum in a manner which we were

not prepared to expect. Without the use of formulæ or even of mathematical symbols, and without a single geometrical diagram, excepting a few in an appendix, he has produced a work as popular as the subject of it will permit, written with much elegance and power, exhibiting deep research, and a thorough knowledge of his subject, and marked with a tender and just estimate of the discoveries which he records, and of the researches which he reviews. In language at once lofty and eloquent, he characterizes the grandeur of his theme and the dignity of its cultivation; and in studying the history of those great men, who in the darkness of civil and ecclesiastical despotism, had to defend truth as well as to discover it, he has not learned the dogma of some modern historians, that science is its own reward, nor has he found any trace of its truth in the pensions and persecutions of Galileo, in the exile and sorrows of Tycho, or in the poverty and afflictions of Kepler.

It would be impossible within the narrow limits of a single article, to convey to our readers anything like an idea of the merits and contents of a work of such magnitude and importance as Mr. Grant's.* We shall, therefore, endeavour to give a brief abstract of its chapters, and dwell more fully upon those more popular topics of recent discovery, which we have not already fully discussed in preceding numbers of this Journal. The History of Physical Astronomy, properly so called, occupies the first *thirteen* chapters of the work, or scarcely one-third of the volume. In his *fourteenth* chapter he treats of the physical constitution of the primary and secondary planets, and he devotes the whole of the *fifteenth* chapter to comets, whether they are the occasional visitors of our system, or complete their course within the orbit of Neptune. The *sixteenth* chapter contains an interesting discussion of various physical principles which affect the apparent place of the heavenly bodies, depending either on the position of the observer, or the properties of light, or the functions of vision. Were the astronomer placed in the centre of the earth, and the earth without an atmosphere, the subjects of *parallax* and *refraction* would have scarcely been parts of Physical Astronomy; and had light passed by bodies without suffering a change in its condition, and the human eye given a sharp definition of luminous objects, the astronomer would not have required to study the subjects of

* Owing to the unusual size of its page, and the smallness of its type, this single volume contains as much matter as three or four ordinary octavo volumes.

diffraction and *irradiation*. In like manner, had light been propagated instantaneously, and the earth been a perfect sphere, the aberration of light, the nutation of the earth's axis, and the procession of the equinoxes would not have embarrassed astronomers in their calculations. The *seventeenth* chapter is occupied with the phenomena of solar and lunar eclipses, the transits of Venus and Mercury over the sun's disc, and the occultation of the stars and planets; and a peculiar interest is given to the chapter by an excellent description of the phenomena which have been recently observed in different parts of the world during total eclipses of the sun, and an examination of the views which they suggest respecting the physical condition of the sun itself. The history of Practical Astronomy, from the period when the Chaldees estimated space and figure by the eye, and measured time by dials and water-clocks, to the chronometers of Frodsham, the great telescopes of Lord Rosse, the mural and transit instruments of Greenwich, and the electro-magnetic apparatus of Mr. Bond, forms the *eighteenth* chapter of the volume, and is treated with the usual ability of the author. From the history of Instrumental Astronomy, and a special account of the Royal Observatory of Greenwich, now pre-eminent among the Observatories of Europe, both from the talents of its director, and the magnificence of its instruments, Mr. Grant passes to the less interesting, though not less important subject of the construction of catalogues of stars, a branch of Astronomy the perfection of which is necessary for the observation of phenomena, and the determination of questions which will occupy a prominent place in the future history of the science. The history of the telescope, from the little Dutch cylinder which the observer put in his pocket, to the tower-like tube of Birr Castle, through which the public are allowed to walk without being able to touch its roof, occupies the *twentieth* chapter; and in the *twenty-first* the work reaches its maturity and manhood in a history and discussion of *Stellar Astronomy*, that branch of the science over which imagination exercises some power, and in which the principles of optics, and the improvement of the telescope have yet a prominent part to play.

In the infancy of Astronomy, and long before the planets and stars were arranged under their proper systems, philosophers were anxious to learn how the Sun and Moon could wheel their way among the stars without a charioteer to guide them, and without any apparent power to urge them along their path, and maintain them

in their course. The idea of a transparent revolving sphere, to which the planet was attached, was in early times not a very extravagant conjecture. Kepler surmounted the difficulties of solid orbs by supposing the planets to be animated; and Descartes advanced a step farther, by maintaining that the planets revolved in ethereal vortices, of which the Sun was the centre, while the satellites revolved round their primary planets by the same agency. Notwithstanding the extravagance of these speculations, sounder opinions began to prevail. The idea of a mutual attraction between the bodies of the system, similar to that of magnets, as maintained by Gilbert, was a step in the right direction; and Kepler, as if to make amends for his early and absurd speculation, announced in 1609, the great fact of mutual attraction or gravitation, and maintained that two stones in absolute space would approach each other and meet at a point, each of them having described a space inversely proportional to its mass. Halley, Hook, and Wren had, at a subsequent period, correct ideas of gravity, and had even discovered that the force which kept the planets in their orbits was in the inverse ratio of the square of the distance; but it was reserved for Newton to establish the law of gravitation in its most general form, namely, *that every individual particle of matter in the universe attracts every other particle with a force directly as the mass of the attracting particle, and inversely as the square of their distances*. Under the guidance of this simple principle, Newton accounted for all the great motions of the solar system. In considering the mutual action of two bodies under the influence of gravity, he demonstrated that their orbits must be conic sections; and in applying the theorem to planets revolving round the sun, he shewed that they all revolved in elliptic orbits, in one of the foci of which the sun was placed. When the action of a third body was taken into account the problem became much more difficult, as in the case of the Earth and Moon when the latter is disturbed by the action of the sun. Even in this case, however, Newton surmounted many of the difficulties; but though he succeeded in referring several of the lunar inequalities to the disturbing action of the sun, he left it to the French Geometers, and to Laplace especially, to complete the theory of the moon, nearly a century after it had been explained in the *Principia*. Directed by the same law, Newton concluded that the comets revolved round the sun in very eccentric ellipses,—that the figure of the earth ought to be an oblate spheroid, with its polar and

equatorial diameters in a certain ratio,—that the action of the sun and moon on the equatorial parts of this spheroid ought to produce a motion in its axis, and a retrocession in the equinoctial points, and that the flux and reflux of the ocean had its origin in the action of the two great luminaries. These grand discoveries are contained in his *Principia Philosophiæ Naturalis*, a work which, from the original and profound views which it contains, and the elegance with which they are expounded, will, to use the language of Laplace, ensure to the *Principia* a pre-eminence above all other productions of human genius.

Nearly half a century elapsed after the publication of this immortal work before any attempt was made to develop and extend the views of its author. Its great truths indeed were appreciated and expounded by several of his countrymen in Scotland* and England; but his distinguished contemporaries abroad—the men most capable of following him in the same train of research, seemed to have been either paralyzed by the grandeur of his discoveries, or to have been withheld, by a jealousy not unknown among philosophers, from acknowledging their truth, and propagating them among their countrymen. Huyghens and Leibnitz, and John Bernouilli, the most profound mathematicians of their day, though they all agreed in opposing the Newtonian truths, had no fixed theories of their own to guide them. Huyghens denounced the vortical system of Descartes as a reverie; while Leibnitz so far supported the idea of an ethereal fluid, as to endeavour to deduce the law of the inverse square of the distance from the elliptic motion of a planet in a vortex. Cassini and Maraldi, and almost all their contemporaries on the Continent, rejected the theory of gravitation; and it was to Voltaire that science is indebted for the first popular account of Newton's discoveries, and for their diffusion as great truths among all ranks of society and intelligence on the Continent.

During the long interregnum which followed the intellectual apotheosis of Newton, the very rivals who had rejected his discoveries were themselves preparing the elements of fresh laurels for the English philosopher,—laurels which, though plaited by themselves, were to be planted by other hands upon his brow. The improvement

of the infinitesimal calculus was the instrument by which alone the discoveries of Newton could be extended and perfected; and Leibnitz, and John and James Bernouilli, were among its most active cultivators. In the state in which it was left by Newton and Leibnitz, its inventors, it was not fitted to grapple with the higher problems in Physical Astronomy which remained to be solved; and it was fortunate for the farther progress of the science that distinguished mathematicians devoted themselves to the perfection of the method of fluxions, and to the invention of new instruments of research.

In the very year in which Newton died, Christian Mayer published, in the *Commentaria Petropolitana* for 1727, an interesting memoir on the application of algebra to trigonometry; and the geometrical theorems which he demonstrated formed the basis of the arithmetic of sines,—a calculus for which Euler provided a notation and an algorithm, which have rendered it one of the most simple and valuable instruments of astronomical inquiry. The invention of the *calculus of partial differences* by d'Alembert, which he first introduced in 1747, in his solution of the problem of vibrating chords, and afterwards extended, in 1752, in his *new theory of the resistance of fluids*, was particularly applicable to the more difficult problems on Physical Astronomy, and when improved and extended by Euler, it became an invaluable instrument of research in every inquiry which demanded the aid either of the pure or mixed mathematics.

Important as were these new instruments of analysis, the *calculus of variations*, discovered by Lagrange in 1760, is doubtless the grandest step in the history of the infinitesimal calculus which was made in the last century. It not only afforded the most complete solution of the problem that gave rise to it, but had an application of the most extensive kind, beyond even the expectations of its inventor. Euler, who had made some progress in the same direction, at once acknowledged the superiority of his youthful rival, and with a nobility of mind, not frequently evinced even among the greatest men, renounced his own imperfect methods, and devoted himself to the study and extension of the new calculus.

Were this the place to record the obligations of Physical Astronomy to the mathematicians of the last century, the labours of Euler would occupy a distinguished place. With an ardour as intense in his old age as it was in his youth, he devoted the whole of his life to the labours of science; and while, during a period of fifty years, he annually communicated original and valuable

* The doctrines of the *Principia* were taught in St. Andrews, in 1690, by James Gregory, and by his brother David, in Edinburgh, before they were introduced into either of the English Universities.—See Brewster's *Life of Sir Isaac Newton*, pp. 173, 174.

memoirs to the Academies of Berlin and Petersburg, he left behind him *two hundred* memoirs ready for publication, in order to fulfil a pledge which he had given to Count Orloff, that for *twenty years after his death* he would supply memoirs for the *Acta Petropolitana*.

But though methods on pure mathematics were essentially necessary to the progress of Physical Astronomy, yet new mechanical principles, or more extended applications of those which were known, were equally required for the profound problems which were yet to be solved. Among these principles, that first hinted at by Fontaine, though discovered also by d'Alembert, is the most important; and though it is based on the recognised principle of the equality of action and reaction, it is nevertheless entitled to the character of being new. D'Alembert has shewn, that if we resolve into two motions $a, a', b, b', \&c.$, the velocities $A, B, \&c.$, of two or more systems of particles or bodies attracting or repelling one another, and if their resolved motions are such, that if the bodies had only the motions $a, b, \&c.$, they would be able to preserve their motion without materially affecting each other, and that if they had only the motions $a, b', \&c.$, they would remain in equilibrio, then the motions $a', b', \&c.$, will be those which they will take in consequence of their mutual action. Lagrange, in his *Mécanique Analytique*, simplified this principle, and exhibited its true value by his successful application of it in Physical Astronomy.

Among the other mechanical principles which contributed to the advancement of Physical Astronomy, was that of the conservation of the momentum of rotatory motion discovered by Euler, Daniel Bernouilli, and the Chevalier d'Arcy, in 1746. Euler and Bernouilli, while investigating the motions of several bodies in a curve of a given form, and capable only of turning round a fixed centre, discovered that the sum of the products of the mass of each body, multiplied by the velocity of its revolution and by its distance from the centre, is independent of the mutual action of the bodies, and remains constant, provided that the bodies are not acted upon by an external cause. This principle, which was almost similarly expressed by d'Arcy, is to a great extent a generalization of Newton's theorem, that the radius vector of every planetary orbit describes equal areas in equal times. The principle of least action introduced by Maupertuis, improved by Euler, and greatly extended by Lagrange, was another principle which lent its aid in the problems of Physical Astronomy.

Such were the implements and munitions of war which, when Newton had given the plan, mathematicians had prepared to scale the heavens, and reduce to the obedience of law the wandering and wayward planets. The restless giants of the sphere had long yielded an unsatisfactory allegiance to Geometry and Analysis; but a century had scarcely elapsed after the completion of the *Principia*, before every act of irregularity within the planetary domains was traced to its cause; and in our own day, the last disturber of our system has been tracked by his own misdeeds, into the dark and distant cave in which he had since his creation been concealed.

About twenty years after the death of Newton, between 1745 and 1747, Euler, Clairaut, and d'Alembert were engaged in the solution of the problem of three bodies. The determination of the longitude at sea had given a peculiar interest to the construction of accurate tables for computing the place of the Moon; and with this stimulus to research, these great men devoted themselves to the study of the lunar perturbations. Clairaut is supposed to have started first in this race of fame, but however this may, they all arrived at the same goal with nearly equal honours; and what is not unusual in the history of Science, another aspirant for fame, without sharing in the heat and toil of the intellectual strife, carried off nobly and honestly, the material prize. In 1746, Euler constructed a set of lunar tables, founded on the results of his researches, but when compared with observation, they were not found to be very superior to those in common use. Clairaut, who had at first tried to compute the inequalities of the Moon's motions by the method of Newton, was obliged to abandon it, and resort to analysis. In the year 1754, Clairaut and d'Alembert published lunar tables founded upon the theoretical results they had obtained. Those of Clairaut were singularly correct, giving the Moon's place very near the truth, while those of d'Alembert, owing to his neglecting the guidance of observation, were of very inferior accuracy. In the year 1758, Euler published a new and more complete set of tables, to accompany his researches on the lunar theory; but though much more conformable with observation than his former set, they yet wanted that degree of accuracy which the necessities of Navigation required.

At this time, the celebrated Tobias Mayer of Göttingen, himself a skilful astronomer, directed his undivided attention to the improvement of the solar and lunar tables. Guid-

ed by the researches of Euler, and a number of accurate observations of his own, he computed a new set, which he transmitted to the English Board of Admiralty in 1755. When compared with the observations of Bradley, these tables were found to give the place of the Moon within *thirty seconds* of the truth. The German astronomer continued till the day of his death to give additional accuracy to the tables, and he left behind him a complete set of solar and lunar tables, for which the Lords of the Admiralty awarded his widow the sum of three thousand pounds, a portion of the reward which they had offered for the discovery of the longitude. These tables were first given to the world in 1770, and when compared with observation by Dr. Bradley the Astronomer Royal, their error was found never to exceed *one minute and a quarter*. As these tables were founded on the theorems furnished by Euler, the Board of Longitude awarded to the distinguished analyst the sum of *three hundred pounds*. As Euler was still in the prime of his intellectual life, though physically advanced in years, he continued to labour at the lunar theory, and with the assistance of his son, and MM. Kraft and Lexell, two eminent Russian astronomers, he constructed a new set of lunar tables, which appeared in 1772, and which, at the suggestion of the illustrious Turgot, were rewarded by the Board of Longitude in France.

At an early stage in the history of the problem of three bodies, an incident of peculiar interest occurred, which may prove at once a beacon and guide to philosophers in other researches than those of Astronomy. In computing from his formulæ the motion of the Moon's apogee, or of the major axis of her elliptical orbit, Clairaut found it to be the same as that given by Newton, namely, only *one half* of what it was known to be by observation. Euler and d'Alembert had obtained the same result, and even Clairaut, placing too little faith in a law which had otherwise proved its correctness and generality, was led to believe that the law of gravitation was neither true nor universal. From this dilemma he endeavoured to extricate himself by the strange supposition that the force with which the Moon is kept in her orbit by the Earth does not decrease as the square of the distance, but that only a part of it followed this law, while another part of it was inversely proportional to the fourth power of the distance! On this occasion the philosopher stepped in to correct and guide the mathematician. Buffon attacked this law with all the severity of criticism. He objected to it justly on the ground of its being defective in that simplicity which char-

acterizes all physical laws, and maintained that there was no *sufficient reason* for determining which part of the attraction should follow the simple law of the square, and which part should follow the biquadrate power of the distance. The three mathematicians refused to admit the aid of metaphysical argument, but the metaphysician triumphed. Clairaut was driven back to his Calculus. He found that he had neglected to include some quantities which he had believed to be too small to affect the result, and carrying his approximation farther than before, he found that the numerator of the fractional term which measured the part of the Earth from which followed the biquadrate power of the distance to be *nothing*, so that no such force was exerted by the Earth. Clairaut publicly acknowledged the mistake he had committed; and by amending his calculation, the theory of the motion of the lunar apogee was found to coincide accurately with observation. This interesting episode in astronomical history is worthy of being studied as a perturbation in the orbit of the Inductive Philosophy. The mathematician trusted too much to his Calculus, and was willing to surrender, at its challenge, a law which Newton had established upon the firmest basis; while the philosopher, with more enlarged conceptions,—with a firmer reliance on the systematic government of the material universe, and without any specific knowledge of the subject, defended so powerfully the *continuity* of the law of gravity as a necessary truth, that the mathematician was sent back into his stronghold to discover the weakness of the position which he had deemed impregnable.

Notwithstanding these great improvements in the lunar theory and the wonderful accuracy of Mayer's tables of the sun and moon, observation had indicated an irregularity in the moon's motions, to which the theory of gravity did not respond. From a comparison of ancient with modern observations, Dr. Halley had proved that the annual revolution of our satellite was performed in less time than formerly. This important fact known by the name of the acceleration of the moon, was admitted by every astronomer, and its magnitude ascertained to be nearly *ten seconds* in a century. Numerous hypotheses were framed to account for it. The most plausible of these was that the planets moved in an ethereal medium by which their motion was resisted, so that the force which retained them in their orbit, would gradually overpower their diminished velocity, and thus shorten their annual period round the central body. This hypothesis was naturally supported by the abettors of

the undulatory theory who required the existence of an ethereal medium for the propagation of light, and it was still more warmly adopted by another class of speculators, who saw in the acceleration of the celestial motions, the method by which infinite wisdom was to put an end to the solar system, by precipitating the secondary planets upon their primary, and the primary planets upon the sun. Laplace admitted that this hypothesis was sufficient to account for the acceleration, but he justly remarked that there were no independent grounds for believing in the existence of an ether universally diffused, and that we were not warranted in adopting such a hypothesis, until it was found that gravitation was incapable of accounting for the fact. In order to explain the moon's acceleration it was supposed that the diurnal motion of the earth might be retarded by the blowing of the easterly gales of the tropics against the mountain ranges which in both hemispheres extend from the equator to the poles; but Laplace, who submitted this view of the subject to a rigorous examination, came to the conclusion that the earth could not experience any retardation from such a cause. Another hypothesis still remained to which the astronomer might appeal not only for an explanation of the secular acceleration of the moon, but also of certain inequalities in the motion of Jupiter and Saturn, which appeared to be in the same category, of not having a periodical character. Gravity had always been conceived as a force which was instantaneous, that is, not propagated in time like rays of light, and hence it occurred to Laplace that if time was necessary for the transmission of gravity, the effect of it would be to modify the intensity of the force. He therefore computed the extent of this modification, and found that it would have no sensible effect upon the moon's motion, unless it exceeded a velocity *eight millions* of times greater than that of light, that is, unless it were 192,000 multiplied by 8,000,000 or 1,536,000,000,000 miles, a velocity which we cannot express in words. After establishing the result Laplace observes that if the moon's acceleration is produced by any other cause, then it will follow that the velocity of gravity must be at least *fifty millions* of times greater than that of light.

In the course of these investigations it was placed beyond a doubt that every inequality in the solar system produced by the action of gravity must be periodical, that is, must, after reaching its maximum, again diminish by the same law according to which it had increased, and hence it became doubly interesting to discover the cause of

phenomena which had the character of periodicity. Laplace again devoted himself to the inquiry, and about the end of 1787 succeeded in finding the true cause of the lunar acceleration. It was known to all the mathematicians engaged in these researches, that there were changes in the eccentricities of the planetary orbits that had a very long period, and therefore the eccentricity of the earth's orbit must experience the same change from the action of the planets. The mean action of the sun must therefore vary with the earth's eccentricity, and the earth having thus more or less power over the moon will accelerate or retard her in her orbit, and thus produce a secular inequality in her mean motion. When the eccentricity is diminishing, or the earth's orbit approaching to a circular form, which has been the case from the time of the earliest observations to the present day, the mean motion of the moon will be accelerated; but when this diminution ceases, and the earth's orbit becomes again more elliptical, the sun's action will increase, and the moon's mean motion will be retarded. Laplace, upon these principles, computed the acceleration, and found it to be about *ten seconds* in a century, as had been previously deduced from observation. The existence of a retarding ether, the influence of eastern gales upon mountain ranges, and the transmission of gravity in time, ceased to be hypotheses recognised in Physical Astronomy.

Having thus completed the theory of the lunar motions, the disturbances produced by the mutual action of the planets occupied the attention of the same mathematician, and were all finally explained by the law of universal gravitation. The problem of these bodies was greatly simplified in the case of the Sun, the Earth, and the Moon, in so far as the sun had a mass so much greater than either of the other two, and was situated at such a great distance from both, but in the case of the Sun, Jupiter, and Saturn, the distance of Jupiter from Saturn may sometimes be nearly the same as the distance of either from the Sun, and hence it is more difficult in such a case to obtain a quickly converging expression of the force which the one planet exerts over the other. The Academy of Sciences of Paris proposed as the subject of their prize for 1748, the inequalities of Jupiter and Saturn. In Euler's Memoir, which gained the prize, he proved that both Jupiter and Saturn were subject to considerable inequalities, arising from their mutual action, but as all these were periodical, returning at intervals not exceeding twenty or thirty years, and depending on the relative positions of

the planets themselves, the great secular inequalities, which in Jupiter had produced in twenty centuries an acceleration of $3^{\circ} 33'$, and in Saturn a retardation of $5^{\circ} 13'$, still remained to be accounted for. The Academy of Sciences was therefore induced to propose the theory of Jupiter and Saturn as the subject of their prize for 1752. Euler again carried off the prize, and in the Memoir which was crowned, he pointed out two inequalities of long periods, depending on the angle formed by the line of the apsides of each planet; but, what was contrary to observation, he made the two quantities equal and additive. Lagrange and Laplace failed in the same research, and Physical Astronomy was again embarrassed with a grave difficulty.

In this emergency Lagrange appeared to throw new light upon this perplexing subject. At the early age of twenty-seven this distinguished mathematician published in the Turin Memoirs for 1763, a new solution of the problem of three bodies, and in applying it to the motions of Jupiter and Saturn he obtained for the former an additive secular equation of nearly *three seconds*, and for the latter a subtractive one of *fourteen seconds*; but though this was a better result than that obtained by Euler, it afforded no explanation of the inequalities in the mean motions of the two bodies. Having observed that periodical inequalities only had been obtained from the theory of gravitation, Lagrange set himself to inquire if continually increasing or continually diminishing inequalities affecting the mean motions of the planets could be produced by their mutual action. By a method of his own invention he found that they could not,—that all such inequalities must be periodical, and that amid all the changes arising from their mutual gravitation, the annual period round the sun of each planet, and the distance of that planet from the sun, suffered no change, thus excluding every source of disorder, and establishing the stability of the solar system.

After the discovery of this great truth it became more probable than before that the secular inequalities of Jupiter and Saturn had their origin in some cause different from their mutual action, and this truth was placed beyond a doubt by the discovery of its true cause. This great honour was reserved for Laplace. By a rigorous inquiry into all the circumstances of this perplexing problem, he found that, in virtue of their mutual action, the mean motion of Jupiter would be accelerated, while that of Saturn was retarded; and that in inequalities of very long periods the relative derangement

of the two planets would be as the masses of each multiplied by the square root of the mean distance of each; that is, that the effect upon Jupiter would be to that on Saturn as 3 to 7, or $3^{\circ} 58'$ for the acceleration of Jupiter, when the retardation of Saturn was $9^{\circ} 16'$, as found by Halley,—the result for Jupiter differing only *nine minutes* from that obtained by Halley. In continuing his inquiry into the cause of these inequalities, he discovered that they arose from the fact that the mean motion of Jupiter was to that of Saturn nearly in the ratio of 5 to 2, the difference being only about the 1-74th part of the mean motion of Jupiter. By integrating the terms containing this quantity, and making the calculation, he found that each planet was subject to an inequality which had a period of 929 years, that of Saturn when a maximum amounting to $48' 44''$, and that of Jupiter to $20' 49''$, with a contrary sign. These inequalities reached their maximum in the year 1560, and from that time the apparent mean motions of the two planets have been approaching to their true mean motions, and became the same in 1790. In comparing the theory with observation, Laplace found that the error in 43 oppositions of Saturn never exceeded $2'$, and was generally correct. He afterwards reduced the error in the case of both planets, to $12''$, although a few years before the best tables of Saturn did not give his place to a greater accuracy than within $20'$. In this manner did the illustrious mathematician liberate the Newtonian theory from the last difficulty with which it was beset, and establish the law of gravitation as the law of the universe.

We cannot conclude this brief notice of the progress of Physical Astronomy in a few of its leading topics, without pondering on the great truths of the stability and permanence of the solar system as established by the discoveries of Lagrange and Laplace. In the present day when worlds and systems of worlds,—when life physical and life intellectual are supposed to be the result of general law, it becomes interesting to look into those conditions of the planetary system which are necessary to its stability, and to consider whether they appear to be the result of necessity or of design. It is an unquestionable corollary from the discoveries of Lagrange and Laplace, that there are three conditions essential to the stability of the solar system, namely, the motion of all the bodies which compose it in the same direction; their motion in orbits slightly elliptical; and the commensurability of their annual periods. These conditions are certainly not the only ones by which a system might be character-

ized. The planets might, like the comets, have been launched in different directions and consequently might have moved in opposite paths. They might have been launched, too, with such degrees of tangential force as to have made them move in orbits of all degrees of ellipticity; and no reason can be assigned why their annual revolutions might not have been incommensurable. The opposite arrangement of the system, therefore, upon which its stability depends, must be the result of design—the contrivance of that omniscience which foresaw all that was future, and of that infinite skill which could provide for the sure permanence of his work. How far the order of our system may be affected by comets moving in so many directions, or by comets that are yet to come, cannot, of course, be determined. We know that the comets which have periodically visited us, whether they complete their orbits within or without our system, have hitherto, owing to the smallness of their mass, produced no perceptible disturbance; and we cannot doubt that the same wisdom which has established such harmony among the planetary bodies, that the inequalities necessarily arising from gravity reach their maximum and then disappear, will also have provided for every future contingency in the system.

Amid all this order, however, we are startled by the discovery of sixteen planetary bodies now revolving in interlacing orbits between Mars and Jupiter. That they are the fragments of a planet that has burst, it is impossible to doubt; and while we stand aghast at an event like this, so little in harmony with the rest of the system, we may rest assured that, like analogous phenomena in the history of our own globe, it will be found to be the result of some general law calculated to display the glory of the Creator, and contribute to the harmony of the universe, and to the happiness of the beings he has made.

In concluding an able and interesting review of the *Mécanique Céleste* of Laplace, the late Professor Playfair asks the question why no British name is ever mentioned in the list of mathematicians who followed Newton in his brilliant career, and completed the magnificent edifice of which he laid the foundation,—a fact, he adds, “the more remarkable that the interests of navigation were deeply involved in the question of the lunar theory, so that no motive, which a regard to reputation or to interest could create, was wanting to engage the mathematicians of England in the inquiry.” Equally jealous of the glory of his country, which he has so largely advanced, M. Arago, when

alluding to the discovery of universal gravitation, had said no Frenchman can reflect without an aching heart on the small participation of his own country in that memorable achievement; and Mr. Grant, in responding to this sentiment, has added, in the language of just severity, that “*if an Englishman could be supposed to be equally sensitive*, he has ample reason to regret the inglorious part his country played during the long period which marked the development of the Newtonian theory. At the beginning of the present century,” he continues, “there was hardly an individual in this country who possessed an intimate acquaintance with the methods of investigation which had conducted the foreign mathematicians to so many sublime results.” Mr. Playfair has stated at some length what he considered as the causes of this condition of British Science, and Mr. Grant has briefly referred to one of the least influential. It is doubtless mortifying to that just pride which every great man must feel in the intellectual glory of his country, that century after century should pass away without any systematic and national correction of so great an evil. More than half a century has passed since the great discoveries in Physical Astronomy have been achieved by foreign mathematicians; and though the number be small, we are thankful to mention the names of Airy and Adams as having greatly contributed to maintain by their labours and discoveries the scientific honour of England.

If the eighteenth century has been distinguished above all that preceded it in the advancement of Physical Astronomy, the nineteenth has surpassed it by the solution of a problem which was never even contemplated as possible, by Newton, or Euler, or Lagrange, or Laplace—the problem of discovering a planet, and determining its place and its elements, by the disturbing action which it exercises upon another. In our thirteenth number, (published in 1847,) we have given a very full account of the history of the discovery of the new planet Neptune by Mr. Adams and M. Leverrier’s solution of what is called the *inverse problem of perturbation*; and we are glad to find, that in so far as concerns the relative merits of the two great mathematicians who solved it, Mr. Grant’s opinion differs very little, if at all, from ours, though we differ from him essentially on other points connected with this interesting subject.

After the determination of the elements of Neptune’s orbit, astronomers were able to ascertain if it had previously been observed as a fixed star. Dr. Petersen of Altona, and Mr. S. Walker of Washington,

found that it had been observed on the 10th of May 1795, by M. le François la Lande, and its place inserted in the *Histoire Céléste* of that astronomer. When the planet had been observed by several astronomers, it became interesting to compare

the elements of its orbit as assumed by Adams and Leverrier with those deduced from observation. The following numbers, as deduced from their theories, are placed beside those obtained from observation:—

	Longitude.	Radius Vector.	Leverrier's Theory.
1840,	312° 17'	30.06	312° 36'
1850,	334 12	29.96	332 25
1860,	356 14	29.87	351 17

		Adam's Theory.		
		1st Approximation.	2d Approximation.	
314°	30'	32.22	316° 10'	33.11
335	36	32.48	335 50	33.67
356	1	33.30	354 39	34.57

The most perfect elements of Neptune's orbit, as computed by Mr. Walker, are as follows:—*

Mean distance,	30.0368	
Mean Long., Jan. 1st, 1847,	326° 32' 44".20	Mean time, Greenwich.
Eccentricity,	.00871946	
Longitude of Perihelion,	47° 12' 6".50	
Longitude of ascending,	130° 4' 20".61	
Inclination of orbit,	1° 36' 58".97	
Mean daily motion,	21".554418	
Periodic time,	164.6181 tropical years.	

The great difference between these elements and those of the hypothetical planets of Adams and Leverrier, and the near commensurability of the mean motions of the two actual planets, has led Professor Pierce† of Harvard College, U.S., and Mr. Gould of Cambridge, U.S., to maintain that Neptune was not discovered by the analysis of the two physical astronomers, but that its discovery was the result of a happy accident. "Their solutions," says Mr. Pierce, "are perfectly correct for the assumption to which they are limited, and must be classed with the boldest and most brilliant attempts at analytical investigation, richly entitling their authors to all the *éclat* which has been lavished upon them on account of the singular success with which they are thought to have been crowned. But their investigations are nevertheless wholly inapplicable to the theory of the mutual perturbations of Uranus and Neptune." This is, we think, rather a harsh decision of our American friends; for though it is doubtless true that the investigations referred to are inapplicable to the theory of the mutual perturbations of the two planets, yet it is a matter of absolute historical truth that the two mathematicians did discover the planet, and that analysis was the instrument they employed.

After Neptune had been discovered instrumentally, by Dr. Galle of Berlin, the astronomical world were delighted with the intelligence that one of his satellites, for we presume there will be several, was dis-

covered by our countryman, Mr. Lassels, at Starfield, near Liverpool. This discovery was made in 1847, with a 20 feet reflector and a 2 feet mirror, which Mr. Lassels had constructed with his own hands. The satellite was subsequently discovered by Otto Struve at Pulkowa, and by Mr. Bond at Cambridge, U.S., with the fine acromatic telescopes which the Emperor of Russia had provided for the one observatory, and the citizens of Boston for the other. The following are its elements, as deduced by Professor Pierce and M. O. Struve.

	h. min. sec.	
Periodic Time,	5 21 12.4	Professor Pierce.
Do. do.	5 21 15	Otto Struve.
Greatest Elongation,	16".5	Professor Pierce.
Do. do.	18	Otto Struve.

Inclination of orbit about 35°, but whether direct or retrograde is not known.

Among the recent discoveries in Astronomy, of which Mr. Grant has given an account, are those of the satellites of *Uranus*. Towards the close of the last century, Sir William Herschel discovered the six satellites which revolve round this planet, and obtained the following results respecting their periodic times and distances.

	days. h. min.	min. sec.	
1st Satellite,	5 21 25	Period.	0 25.05 Distance
2d do.	8 17 1		0 33.09
3d do.	10 23 4		0 38.57
4th do.	13 11 5		0 44.23
5th do.	38 1 49		1 08.46
6th do.	107 16 40		2 57.92

Owing to the smallness of these bodies, and the faintness of their lights, they have been seen only by a few astronomers. Sir John Herschel observed them in 1828. Mr. Lassels saw the *first* and the *third*, Mr. Lamont the *second* and *sixth*. The remarkable peculiarity in Uranus's system of satellites is, that their orbits are inclined at nearly right angles to the ecliptic, and that their motions are retrograde. In continuing to observe these small bodies, Mr. Lassels discovered two new satellites, on the 24th October, 1851. Their periods are about 2.506 days and 4.150 days, and they seem, like the rest, to move in orbits, inclined al-

* Smithsonian Contributions to Knowledge, vol. ii. p. 32, 1851.

† Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Science, vol. i. p. 341.

most at right angles to the plane of the ecliptic.

Of all the recent discoveries in Astronomy, the most interesting are those which relate to the satellites and ring of Saturn. Astronomers had observed that a wide space separated the orbits of the fourth and fifth satellites of this planet, and in this space an eighth satellite has been recently discovered by the independent observation of Mr. Lassels in England, and Professor Bond in America, on the very same day, namely, the 19th September, 1848. It is a curious circumstance, mentioned by Mr. Grant, that Huygens in his *Cosmotheoreos* had predicted the existence of this satellite. In conformity with the barbarous nomenclature of the satellites of this planet,* the name of *Hyperion* has been given to the new satellite, whose period seems to be about twenty-two days and a half. The fifth satellite of Saturn, discovered by Cassini in 1684, and now enjoying the name of *Rhea*, was found to undergo such great variations in its light as sometimes to disappear altogether. Cassini concluded from his observations, that this satellite, like our moon, revolved round its axis, in the same time that it performed its revolution round Saturn; and Sir William Herschel found that the variation in its brightness was equal to a change from the second to the fifth magnitude.

The most interesting results have been very recently obtained respecting the ring of Saturn, one of those celestial objects which has astonished the vulgar as much as it has perplexed the philosopher. Cassini discovered what was long called the list of the ring, by which it was divided into two concentric rings. This fact was confirmed by Sir William Herschel. Short and various modern astronomers have observed certain lines on the ring, which they consider as indicating the existence of several concentric rings; but such a structure has not been observed by the telescopes of Herschel, Struve, or Lord Rosse. The following dimensions of the two rings of Struve will enable the reader to understand the recent discoveries which we are about to mention. One second in this table corresponds to 4387 miles.

1. Exterior diameter of the <i>Exterior Ring</i> ,	40".095
2. Interior diameter of the <i>Exterior Ring</i> ,	35.289
3. Exterior diameter of the <i>Interior Ring</i> ,	34.475
4. Interior diameter of the <i>Interior Ring</i> ,	26.668
5. Equatorial diameter of <i>Saturn</i> ,	17.991
6. Breadth of the <i>Exterior Ring</i> ,	2.403
7. Breadth of the division between the Rings,	0.408
8. Breadth of the <i>Interior Ring</i> ,	3.903
9. Distance of the <i>Interior Ring</i> from the Planet,	4.339
10. Radius of <i>Saturn's</i> Equator,	8.995
11. Thickness of the ring estimated at from	0.05 to 0.3

* See this Review, No. xvi.

When the edge of the ring was turned to the earth, Sir William Herschel observed several lucid protuberances, and from the change in their position, he inferred that the ring moved round Saturn in $10^h 32' 15''.4'$, a result which Laplace deduced from a consideration of the conditions under which the rings would be maintained in equilibrio, by the action of the planet and their own centrifugal force. These conditions were, that the particles composing the rings should be homogeneous, and move freely among one another like those of a fluid. The period of rotation thus obtained was only $1' 21''$ greater than that given by Sir William Herschel. It is proper, however, to state, that various phenomena have been observed by different Astronomers, which seem incompatible with a rotatory motion of the ring. One of the most singular of these facts is that observed by Struve, who, in 1826, found that the ring was not situated concentrically with the body of Saturn. The distance of the outer edge of the ring from the body of the planet was $11''.288$ on the east side, and $11''.073$ on the west side, the difference between which is $0''.215$, or about 943 miles. In examining the extremely black shadow of the ring upon the body of the planet, in a singularly favourable state of the atmosphere, Mr. Lassels observed notches in the line of the shadow, as if it were broken up into a line of dots, indicating, as he thinks, mountains upon the plane of the ring.

Such are the phenomena of the two rings of Saturn, so long known to astronomers; but we have now to record the discovery of another ring within the two bright rings already described. This discovery was made on the 4th December 1850 by Mr. Bond. Mr. Dawes had also observed it in England on the 29th November, and what is still more strange, it had been seen by Dr. Galle of Berlin so early as 1838. We have had an opportunity of seeing it more than once through Lord Rosse's telescopes. This new ring is much inferior in brightness to the two outer ones. It occupies about *two-fifths* of the interval between the inner side of the interior ring and the body of the planet, and is supposed to be merely a continuation of the inner ring. Since Mr. Grant's volume was published, we have obtained new and more correct information respecting this remarkable addition to the appendages of Saturn.* When Mr. Bond, however, visited, in 1851, the central observatory of Pulkowa in Russia, it was arranged between him and

* *L'Institut*, January 5, 1853, p. 6, where an extract is given from Fuss's Report of the Proceedings of the Academy of Sciences of St. Petersburg.

M. Otto Struve, that they should together make a series of observations on Saturn with the great Munich telescope at Pulkowa. With this noble instrument they discovered and saw distinctly the dark interval which separates the new ring from the two old ones, and the limits of this interval were so well marked, that they were able to measure its dimensions. They perceived also at the inner margin of the new ring an edge or border (*lisere*) feebly illuminated, which might well be the commencement of another similar appendage or formation, although the line of separation was not yet visible. These two able astronomers have taken accurate micrometrical measurements of this ring, which form the subject of a joint memoir, of which the following are the principal results:—"1. The new ring is not subject to very rapid changes. 2. It is not of very recent formation; for it is quite certain that it has been seen, if not recognised according to its true character, ever since the improvements upon astronomical telescopes have enabled astronomers to see the belts on the surface of the planet, or at least since the beginning of the last century. 3. *That the inner border of the annular system of Saturn has, since the time of Huygens, been gradually approaching to the body of the planet,* and therefore it follows that there has been a successive enlargement of this system. 4. That it is at least very probable that the approach of the rings towards the planet is caused particularly by the successive extension of the inner or middle ring. Hence it follows that Saturn's system of rings does not exist, as has been generally supposed, in a state of stable equilibrium, and that *we may expect, sooner or later, perhaps in some dozen of years, to see the rings united with the body of the planet!*"

There is no branch of astronomy more exciting to our curiosity than that which relates to the nature and structure of the sun, the great source of light and heat, on which depends the very existence of organic life. Mr. Grant has, therefore, treated very fully of the subject of the solar spots, and he has devoted nearly a whole chapter to a highly interesting detail of those curious optical phenomena which have been studied in every part of Europe during the total eclipse of the sun in 1851. We have already,* in a preceding Number, treated of the subject of the solar spots, and given a brief account of Sir John Herschel's theory of their formation, though we considered all such theories as founded upon facts too few in number, and too limited in their character, to have

even the vestige of truth. Before we can form any decided opinion on the nature of the sun's spots, we must know something precise of the nature of the sun's surface on which these spots exist,—of the character of the light which issues from its different parts, and of the distribution of heat in radiating from different parts of his disc. From a long series of experiments, we have placed it beyond a doubt that the light which emanates from different parts of the sun has the same composition, that is, it contains fixed lines, similar in number and character. So early as the beginning of the 17th century, Lucas Valerio and Frederick Cesi had asserted that the solar rays were more powerful in the centre than at the margin of his disc. M. Volpicelli, during the solar eclipse of the 28th July 1851, had ascertained, by means of the thermo-actinometer of Melloni, that the calorific radiations of the sun increased from the circumference to the centre of his disc, and M. Secchi, after having confirmed this fact, found that the maximum effect was produced in the equator of the sun. Subsequently to this discovery, M. Melloni found "that the proportion of the solar rays transmitted by a film of water placed between two plates of German glass, and the same rays transmitted by a plate of smoked rock crystal, varied with the different thicknesses of the atmosphere which they traversed, and that this variation followed laws so different, in passing from the one body to the other, that it took under the same circumstances opposite signs." On the invitation of M. Melloni, M. Volpicelli made a series of valuable observations at the Pontifical Observatory, of which the following are some of the principal results, which, as they have not appeared in any English work, we hope will interest the reader. In the following table the calorific energy of the incident solar ray is supposed to be 100, and the table is divided into *two* groups, *one* in which the calorific radiation diminishes, and another in which it increases in passing from the meridian to the horizon.

CALORIFIC RADIATION.

FIRST GROUP.		SECOND GROUP.	
	Near the Meridian.		Near the Horizon.
Water.	60 40	Quartz, not smoked,	70 80
Oil of Turpentine,	54 45	Glass, clear,	84 93
Solution of Alum,	57 43	Alum,	5 10
Nitric Acid,	65 52	Sulphate of lime,	6 8
Alcohol,	62 51	Glass, green,	5 9
Sulphuric ether,	58 35	Glass, yellow,	12 18
Ordinary glass,	73 58	Glass, blue,	13 18
		Glass, blue,	75 100
		Rock Salt,	461 48
		Sulphuric Acid,	55 60
		Quartz, smoked,	6 11
		Rock Salt, smoked,	5 9

From these experiments M. Volpicelli

* No. XVI., pp. 267, 268.

concludes that the calorific rays of the sun are composed of heterogeneous elements,—that the atmosphere of the earth absorbs these elements in different ways, accordingly as they are more or less thick,—that the intensity of the incident solar ray depends on the thickness of atmosphere through which it passes, and that on this thickness depends the qualities of the calorific element.

In continuing his experiments on diathermal substances whose thickness was about 1 centimetre, M. Volpicelli obtained the following results.

1. Quartz and glass, when both are colourless, are the most diathermal substances in relation to the solar rays, that is, they transmit them more copiously than any other substance, the incident solar ray and the transmitted solar ray differing in temperature only *one degree* of the galvanometer from noon till three-quarters of an hour before sunset, so that we may regard these two substances as giving a free passage to all the kinds of calorific solar rays after they have traversed the atmosphere.

2. Rock salt, which has the property of transmitting very copiously ordinary heat, transmits much less copiously than many others the solar heat. Admitting what M. Volpicelli thinks very probable, that the Sun is the source of all kinds of calorific radiations, he concludes that the two atmospheres, the one solar and the other terrestrial, extinguish a great portion of the rays which abound in the sources of terrestrial light, namely, of those which Melloni calls obscure radiations, and which he has shown to have specific properties of transmission and diffusion very different from those of luminous heat.

3. Three plates, one of rock salt, another of clear alum, and a third of crystallized sulphate of lime, when combined give severally a white light *deprived of heat*, which proves that the alum and the sulphate of lime destroy each other's effects. By such a combination we can make the calorific radiations of the Sun as feeble as those of the Moon, and yet preserve more intense light.

4. The free solar radiation maintains its calorific energy from noon till 3^h 30^m. It then grows feeble, and does not become invisible till within three-quarters of an hour of sunset.

In addition to the facts we have already stated respecting the distribution of heat in the Sun's disc, M. Volpicelli expects to be able to shew that there are four singular points, viz., two *maxima* in the Sun's equator, and two *minima* in the poles.*

We regret that our limits will not permit us to give even the substance of the very instructive and interesting details which Mr. Grant has collected respecting the phenomena of total eclipses, and especially of that of July 8, 1842, which was so carefully observed in Italy by Mr. Airy and Mr. Baily, and other astronomers placed in different parts of the earth over which the centre of the moon's shadow was to pass. But as Mr. Grant's work, probably from having been printed before the publication of the accounts of the solar eclipse of July 28, 1851,* does not contain any account of them, we shall give our readers a brief account of the principal phenomena which were observed in various parts of the world, by English, French, German, and Russian astronomers. The most interesting phenomenon in a total eclipse is what is called the *corona* or luminous ring, interesting not merely from its beauty and splendour, but from its obvious connexion with the Sun itself. Generally speaking, the corona is a uniform ring of light, extending to the distance of from 3 to 5 minutes from the Moon's limb, and often shading off so gradually that it is difficult to trace its limit. It was intensely brilliant at Lipesk as observed in 1842 by Otto Struve, who traced it to a distance of 25' from the Moon's limb. Diverging rays of unequal length generally issue from the corona. Mr. Baily observed that the diverging rays were so numerous that they deprived the corona of the appearance of a ring. At Lipesk the light of the corona seemed to be in a state of violent agitation, and Mr. Baily observed at Pavia that it had a flickering appearance. In 1851 at Christiania, Mr. Snow saw the corona through a pretty thick cloud, and describes its light "as not uniformly dispersed, *but in irregularly radiating bundles or masses*." At Sarpborg "the corona seen by the naked eye appeared a ring of white light in the clouds, its breadth being nearly equal to the Moon's radius, and gradually fading away without radiation." At Fredrichsvaarn "the corona was a little irregular, and as *if composed of separate diverging rays*." Mr. Lassell's observations on the corona at the Trolhatta Falls are very interesting. He describes the corona as perfectly concentric, brilliant, and radiating, some of the rays appearing larger than the rest. He thought the corona gave as much light as the full Moon. Mr. Williams, observing at the same place, says that the corona "was divided by radial lines, and presented the appearance of luminous brushes shot from behind the Moon." At

* See *Comptes Rendus*, &c., tom. xxxv. p. 953, December 27, 1852; or *L'Institut*, January 5, 1853.

* Mr. Grant has noticed this eclipse in a few lines in his Appendix, No. VI.

Gottenburg the corona appeared to be composed of rays proceeding from the centre of the double disc. Mr. Swan describes the corona seen in the telescope as silvery white, distinctly radiated, and without any trace of an annular structure. Brilliant beams of light shone out in various directions, to some distance beyond its general outline. Mr. John Adie says, "the corona was brightest near the Sun, and extended about 1-3d of the Moon's diameter, of a soft silvery white, with brighter coruscations shooting through it beyond the general light, which gave it a flickering appearance. In one place these coruscations extended to about 2-3ds of the Moon's diameter." Mr. Airy, who has given the best description of the corona, represents it in his drawing as composed of bundles of rays. Its breadth was a little less than the Moon's diameter, its structure radiated, and terminating very indefinitely, in a way which reminded him of the ornament placed round a mariner's compass.

We have given these copious descriptions of the corona because we consider it a most important phenomenon, and proving that this is the corona of the Sun itself, rendered visible by the interposition of the Moon. The existence of such a corona round the Sun was long ago deduced from observations of a totally different kind, by the writer of this article, and connected with some new affections of light, which, though read to one of our Scientific Societies, has not yet been published.*

The phenomena which have been called "Baily's beads," and the red cusps and protuberances which protrude from the dark limb of the Moon, have attracted the peculiar notice of astronomers. In observing the annular eclipse of the 15th May 1836, Mr. Baily noticed that when the cusps of the sun were separated about 40°, there was suddenly formed round that part of the

moon's disc that was about to enter upon the sun's disc, a row of bright points like a string of luminous beads, irregular in their shape, and at unequal distances from one another. They were formed as rapidly as if by the ignition of a train of gunpowder. Believing that this phenomenon indicated the completion of the annulus, he was about to note the time of its occurrence, when he was surprised by the sight of other phenomena—"by finding that these luminous points as well as the dark intervening spaces increased in magnitude, some of the contiguous ones appearing to run into each other like drops of water: for the rapidity of the change was so great, and the singularity of the appearance so fascinating and attractive, that the mind was for the moment distracted and lost in the contemplation of the scene, so as to be unable to attend to every minute occurrence. Finally," he continues, "as the moon pursues her course, these dark intervening spaces (which at their origin had the appearance of lunar mountains in high relief, and which still continued attached to the Sun's border), were stretched out into long, black, thick parallel lines joining the limbs of the Sun and Moon, when all at once they suddenly gave way, and left the circumference of the Sun and Moon in these points, as in the rest, comparatively smooth and circular, and the Moon perceptibly advancing on the face of the Sun."

The singular nature of these phenomena excited much interest, but neither in the annular eclipse of February 18, 1838, observed in the United States, both at Princetown and Washington, were the beads or the dark lines seen, as described by Mr. Baily. In some cases beads were seen at the formation and rupture of the annulus, but they seemed to depend on the colour of the darkening glass. Mr. Baily himself, who went to Italy to observe the total eclipse of 1842, was unable to perceive any trace either of the beads or the threads. In the eclipse of July 28, 1851, Mr. Airy saw distinctly "the extremely mountainous outline of the sun's disc," and "watching carefully the approach of the Moon's limb, he saw both limbs perfectly well defined to the last, and saw the line becoming narrower, and the cusps becoming sharper, without any distortion or prolongation of the limbs." "I saw," he continues, "the Moon's serrated limb advance up to the Sun's, and saw the light of the Sun glimmering through the hollows between the mountain peaks, and saw those glimmering spots extinguished one after another, in extremely rapid succession, but without any of the appearances which Mr. Baily

* Since this part of our article was written, the views which it contains respecting the corona have been singularly confirmed by the descriptions of the Russian astronomers who occupied twenty-two different stations stretching along the whole width of the dark belt from the west of Russia to the shores of the Caspian Sea. The weather was favourable at ten only of these stations, but in all of these the success of the observers was complete. The conclusions deduced from these observations are, that the red prominences which were observed in the eclipse of 1842, are part of the luminous sphere of the Sun, and are intimately connected with the phenomena of the spots or faculæ, and that the corona is also an integrant part of the body of that luminary. The brilliant aspect which the corona presented to Colonel Choctzko in the Caucasus at the height of 4000 yards, or about 2½ miles above the level of the sea, placed it in his opinion beyond a doubt that this luminous phenomenon was not produced by the earth's atmosphere.

has described." Mr. Hind saw the beads of Mr. Bailly, which he describes as a string of them, of irregular size and shape; and about three or four seconds before the eclipse was total, Mr. Dawes saw them to the amount of *nine or ten*: and both he and Mr. Hind regard them as caused by the light passing between the mountains on the Moon's edge. That the beads are an optical phenomenon cannot be doubted, and we think there can be as little doubt that they are produced principally by the diffraction of the edges of rugged and angular apertures, such as those which must be formed between the summits of mountain ranges or of individual mountains.

The red cusps or protuberances, the insulated red patches, and the red sierras or notched mountain-ranges, which appear to project from the moon's disc in total eclipses, are phenomena not so easily explained. These protuberances have been noticed by various observers; but the attention of astronomers was particularly called to them by Mr. Airy and Mr. Bailly, in their account of the total eclipse of 1842. They were seen, however, most advantageously, by a great number of observers, during the eclipse of 1851, and an excellent abstract of the results which they obtained was published in the Report of the Council of the Astronomical Society.* The protuberances have been differently described by those who saw them. One large one was seen by several of the astronomers. Mr. Airy describes it as like a *bomerang*; and in his drawing it consists of two arms very nearly at right angles to each other. Mr. Dawes likens it to a Turkish scimitar, bent rather suddenly at the apex; while others make it like a sickle with the top broken off. The insulated mass which accompanied it has also been variously described. Mr. Airy saw it like a balloon with well-defined borders; and Mr. Dawes, like the top of a conical mountain with its top cut off by mist. Some describe it as a spiderlike irregular mass; while others distinctly saw arches of light connecting it with the large protuberance. "It seems indeed," says the Report, "impossible to reconcile these statements without some hypothesis of *mirage*-effect, or other modifying cause, existing either in the neighbourhood of the moon, or in our own atmosphere." The position of these protuberances on the moon's limb was carefully observed. The observers situated farthest to the north saw on the northern limb protuberances hidden from the more southern observers,

and those near the southern boundary saw protuberances hidden from more northerly observers. In the report of the Council already quoted, they affirm it to be *most decisively proved* from the observations, that these wonderful phenomena belong to the Sun. "Those," they add, "that were observed on the eastern limb became quickly hidden, while others sprang up on the western limb, that is, they were respectively covered and revealed on the eastern and western limbs of the sun by the advancing Moon. Those also that were immediately seen on the western limb increased in height during the totality of the eclipse. Finally, one, at least, was seen suspended, as it were, above the Sun's disc, having no connexion whatever with the limb."

Arising, doubtless, from the same cause, whatever it may be, are the deep red *sierras*, or jagged mountain-chains, which were distinctly seen by almost all the astronomers. They are described as "a succession of scarlet-coloured prominences, united at the base by a continuous red band." At a time when Mr. Airy saw the sierra, in the telescope, much more brilliant in its *scarlet* colour than any of the detached prominences, he observed along the north horizon to about 30° or 35° of altitude, that the sky was illuminated with a very red light, for a breadth of about 90° of azimuth, which he considered as the probable effect of the brilliantly red sierra. In the report already quoted, the Council speak of their appearance only as *red*, but in the separate reports, other colours are mentioned. Eight of the astronomers describe the colour of the protuberances as *pink*, or *full rose* colour; Mr. Dawes as *rich carmine*, *purplish* at the apex. Mr. Hind speaks of the *rose red* at the tops of the prominences gradually fading towards their bases, and in their place a *bright narrow* line of a deep *violet* tint appearing along the moon's limb; while Mr. Lassels says, that their colour was a *most brilliant lake*, or a *splendid pink*. In the eclipse of 1842, Mr. Bailly saw them of a *peach blossom* colour, and what we consider as interesting, M. Littrow, of Vienna, saw them first *white* or colourless, and then of *rose colour*, which changed to *violet*, passing afterwards, in a *reverse order*, through the same tints. In order to mark the correctness, and importance of this change of colour, M. Littrow adds, that "the protuberances, were visible before they assumed a coloured hue, and they continued to be visible after their colour was dissipated."*

Although it seems to be the present opi-

* See their Monthly Notices, vol. xii. p. 107, Feb. 13, 1852.

* Annuaire, p. 434.

nion, that these protuberances neither belong to the Moon nor are produced by our atmosphere, yet there are great difficulties attending the hypothesis that they are phenomena produced in the Sun's atmosphere, and are meteorological phenomena. In the first place, there is no proof whatever that the Sun is surrounded with an atmosphere, and even if the facts which are brought forward to prove it were real and well-observed phenomena, they might have arisen from other causes than an atmosphere. Mr. Grant, and we presume all who believe the cusps and protuberances to be meteorological, regard their *red* colour as indicating that they possess the property of absorbing in a great degree all the rays of the spectrum except the red, as in the case of terrestrial clouds when they are seen illuminated by the Sun after his disappearance under the horizon. But surely these cusps have no resemblance to clouds, and if they had been *blue* instead of red the argument would have been equally strong; for we know nothing about the absorbing power of an atmosphere round the Sun, which must have very different properties from ours. The *radial appearance*, and the *constant emanation of the rays outwards* prove only a radiating cause which may exist without either an atmosphere or clouds. In the corona of the eclipse of 1733, some of the radiations of *unequal length* were observed to *maintain constantly the same position*, and Mr. Grant argues from this, that the phenomena could not be due to the *irregular scintillation of a luminous object*. But we would desire to know how many seconds are included in the term *constantly*, and why successive scintillations might not, while the impression of the first remains on the retina, shoot out to the same distance. Neither astronomers nor optical writers have yet considered what the phenomena should be in the region next to the solar disc, from the collision of the waves or rays issuing in such a condensed state as they must do from every part of the Sun's disc, and in every possible direction from that part into surrounding space. If it has been believed, on the authority of experiment, that some of the rays which cross one another in the focus of a speculum are either destroyed or altered in their character, how much greater changes must take place in the space immediately surrounding the Sun, where rays of such intensity are crossing each other in every possible direction. The simplest of all conceptions respecting the *red cusps* is, that they are outbursts of flame modified by the exhalations which may accidentally accompany them.

Among the interesting topics of modern Astronomy we must rank the discovery of comets revolving in elliptic orbits within the limits of the solar system. On the 22d November 1843, M. Faye, of the Royal Observatory of Paris, discovered a comet whose motions could not be reconciled by supposing it to move in a parabola. Dr. Goldschmidt found that the observations indicated an elliptic orbit with a period of $7\frac{1}{2}$ years; and M. Leverrier, after determining that it would be retarded 7.67 days by the action of the planets, predicted its return to its perihelion on the 4th of April 1851. The comet did return to its appointed time. It was first observed by Professor Challis with the Northumberland achromatic on the 20th November 1850, and the observations which he has made upon it harmonize remarkably with the calculations of the French astronomer.

Another periodic comet was discovered on the 29th August 1844, by M. de Vico, of the Observatory at Rome. M. Faye found that it had an elliptic orbit, with a period of about $5\frac{1}{2}$ years. It was at first supposed that it was the same comet which Tycho and Rothmann had observed in 1585; but Leverrier has shewn that it is not the same, but is identical with that observed by De la Hire in 1670. "Thus," says Mr. Grant, "although the comet of 1844 has doubtless formed a part of the solar system for many ages, and has frequently approached very near the Earth, history records only one instance of its appearance previous to the year 1844. The planet Jupiter, which in all probability chained it down originally to the system, will one day act upon it with equal intensity, but in an opposite direction; and we may reasonably presume that when it has escaped from his influence it will again fly off into infinite space, describing a parabola or hyperbola."

The motion of the whole of the solar system, with the comets which belong to it, round some distant centre, at the rate of 57 miles in a second, has now become one of the great truths of Astronomy. We have already, in our review of Sir John Herschel's *Astronomical Observations*,* given a full account of the researches of Argelander, Otto Struve, and M. Peters, and of the general result deduced from them by M. Struve. According to their calculations, the point of the celestial sphere to which the solar system is approaching is situated in

Right ascension.	Declination north.
259° 9'.4	34° 36'.5

* See this Review, vol. viii. p. 285.

Our countryman, the late Mr. Galloway, obtained a remarkable confirmation of this result by examining the proper motions of 81 stars, determined by comparing their places in La Caille's catalogue, about the middle of the eighteenth century, with their places as deduced from the observations of Johnson and Henderson. He found the point in the heavens to which our system is approaching to be in

Right ascension. Declination north.
259° 46'.2 32° 29'.6

More recently, Mr. Main has communicated to the Astronomical Society* a paper on the proper motion of 875 stars, which, Mr. Grant says, establishes beyond all doubt the general accuracy of the various investigations respecting the part of the heavens to which our system is advancing at the rate of 154 millions of miles annually.

There is no branch of Astronomy where the progress of discovery has been more rapid than in that which relates to the new planets between Mars and Jupiter, to which we have already referred. Between the years 1801 and 1807 four of these small planets were discovered, and between the year 1845 and 1853 no fewer than *nineteen* have been added to the list of planetary bodies. Our countryman, Mr. J. Russell Hind, the celebrated astronomer in Mr. Bishop's observatory in Regent's Park, has discovered no fewer than *eight*

of these bodies, while Mr. Gasparis of Naples has discovered *six* of them. The following Table exhibits the names given to the new planets, the date of their discovery, and the name of the astronomers by whom they were discovered:—

Ceres,	1801 January 1,	Piazzi.
Pallas,	1802 March 28,	Olbers.
Juno,	1804 September 1,	Harding.
Vesta,	1807 March 29,	Olbers.
Astræa,	1845 December 8,	Hencke.
Hebe,	1847 July 1,	Hencke.
Iris,	1847 August 13,	Hind.
Flora,	1847 October 18,	Hind.
Metis,	1848 April 25,	Gasparis.
Hygeia,	1849 April 12,	Gasparis.
Parthenope,	1850 May 11,	Gasparis.
Victoria,	1850 September 13,	Hind.
Egeria,	1850 November 2,	Gasparis.
Irene,	1851 May 19,	Hind.
Eunomia,	1851 July 29,	Gasparis.
Psyche,	1852 March 17,	Gasparis.
Thetis,	1852 April 17,	Luther.
Melpomene,	1852 June 24,	Hind.
Fortuna,	1852 August 22,	Hind.
Massilia,	1852 September 9,	Valz.
Calliope,	1852 November 16,	Hind.
Lutetia,	1852 November 15,	Goldschmidt.
Thalia,	1852 December 15,	Hind.

The elements of the orbits of all these planets, excepting the two last, have been accurately computed, and through the kindness of Mr. Hind we are enabled to present our readers with the following interesting Table, containing the elements of their orbits, from which the position of all their elliptic paths may be projected:—

In this Table the longitude of the perihelion and of the ascending node, are for the equinox of 1852.

Elements of twenty-one of the twenty-three new Planets between Mars and Jupiter.

Names.	Longitude of Perihelion.	Longitude of Ascending Node.	Inclination of Orbit.	Eccentricity.	Mean distance from the sun.	Period in Years.
Ceres,	148° 20'	80° 51'	10° 37'	0.0765	2.7676	4.604
Pallas,	121 26	172 45	34 37	0.2393	2.7726	4.617
Juno,	54 15	170 56	13 3	0.2562	2.6688	4.360
Vesta,	250 56	103 22	7 8	0.0889	2.3613	3.629
Astræa,	135 43	141 28	5 19	0.1887	2.5774	4.138
Hebe,	15 15	138 32	14 47	0.2020	2.4253	3.777
Iris,	41 20	259 44	5 28	0.2323	2.3853	3.684
Flora,	32 50	110 21	5 53	0.1568	2.2018	3.267
Metis,	71 33	68 29	5 36	0.1228	2.3869	3.681
Hygeia,	228 3	287 39	3 47	0.1009	3.1514	5.594
Penelope,	317 4	125 0	4 37	0.0980	2.4481	3.830
Victoria,	301 54	235 20	8 23	0.2185	2.3348	3.568
Egeria,	118 17	43 17	16 33	0.0863	2.5825	4.150
Irene,	178 27	86 51	9 6	0.1690	2.5819	4.149
Eunomia,	28 9	293 55	11 44	0.1872	2.6398	4.289
Psyche,	6 20	150 33	3 2	0.1157	2.9466	5.058
Thetis,	259 13	125 26	5 36	0.1309	2.4798	3.904
Melpomene,	15 25	149 59	10 10	0.2159	2.2945	3.475
Fortuna,	31 16	211 1	1 33	0.1554	2.4459	3.825
Massilia,	94 32	207 8	0 40	0.1746	2.4493	3.833
Calliope,	58 44	66 41	13 54	0.1001	2.9129	4.972
Lutetia, } Thalia, }	The Elements not yet accurately determined.					

* Mem. Astron. Sec. vol. xix. p. 121.

Such is a brief notice of the more recent discoveries in Astronomy, both as made in Europe and America. There are, perhaps, none of the sciences which are advancing with such rapidity as that of Astronomy, and whether we look to the liberality with which it is encouraged by enlightened governments, or to the munificence with which private individuals have contributed magnificent telescopes, and erected observatories, we anticipate an early and a rich harvest of discovery. The grand results obtained with Lord Rosse's telescopes; the discovery of *eight* new planets by Mr. Hind in Mr. Bishop's observatory; the discovery of *four* new satellites, *two* to Uranus, *one* to Saturn, and *one* to Neptune, by Mr. Lassels; the discovery of a new planet, and the formation of a catalogue of 14,888 stars, at Mr. Cooper's observatory, at Markree Castle, in the north of Ireland; the work done by Mr. Challis at Cambridge, with the Northumberland telescope, without mentioning the labours of astronomers located at royal and public observatories, hold out reasonable hopes of fresh achievements in practical astronomy.*

In the United States of America great progress has been recently made in practical astronomy. A central observatory, under the superintendence of Lieutenant Maury, has been established at Washington. In other cities similar institutions have been founded, the most celebrated of which is the observatory of Harvard University, Cambridge, under the direction of Mr. Bond, furnished with one of the finest achromatic telescopes that has come from the great workshop of Merz at Munich. It is to America also that we are indebted for the successful application of electro-magnetism for the purposes of geodesy and astronomy. In 1844 the electric telegraph was employed in determining the difference of time between Washington and Baltimore, and more recently between other places. To America belongs also the invention of the collimating telescope and of the electro-magnetic apparatus for recording transit observations of the celestial bodies. This apparatus, which is said to be of the joint invention of Mr. Bond, Mr. S. Walker, Professor Mitchell, and Dr. Locke, was exhibited at the British Association by Mr. Bond, junior, and afterwards, on our earnest application to the commissioners, at

the Great Exhibition, where it was honoured with a council medal.* As soon as a transit wire is seen to bisect a star, the observer, with his finger, presses upon a key, which breaks or completes the galvanic circuit, and the record of the observation is, within the 20th of a second, instantaneously made upon a cylinder, which revolves uniformly by means of a clock. The Astronomer Royal has introduced this instrument into the Observatory at Greenwich, and Mr. Grant informs us that it is contemplated in connexion with this improvement, to transmit Greenwich time, by means of the electric telegraph, to the chief places in the kingdom. The Royal Observatory will thus also be enabled to record transits simultaneously with foreign observatories, and thus determine more accurately their respective longitudes.

But, in looking into the future of Astronomy, our mind rests with most satisfaction on the prospect of sending out to a tropical climate, and planting high above the grosser regions of the atmosphere a gigantic telescope, fitted at once to penetrate far into the nebular regions of space, to detect small planets, comets, and satellites, within the limits of the Solar System, and to disclose the phenomena which exist on the surfaces of our own planets and satellites. This plan was, we believe, first proposed by ourselves in this Journal, so far back as 1844, in a review on Lord Rosse's Telescope. "In cherishing these high expectations," we said, "we have not forgotten that the state of our atmosphere must put some limits to the magnifying power of our telescopes. In our variable climate, indeed, the vapours and local changes of temperature, and consequent inequalities of refraction, offer various obstructions to the extension of astronomical discovery. But we must meet the difficulty in the only way in which it can be met. The astronomer cannot command a thunderstorm to cleanse the atmosphere, and he must therefore undertake a pilgrimage to better climates—to Egypt or to India, in search of a purer and more homogeneous medium, or even to the flanks of the Himalaya and the Andes, that he may erect his watch-tower above the grosser elements of the atmosphere. In some of those brief yet lucid intervals which precede or follow rain, when the remotest objects present themselves in sharp outline, and minute detail, discoveries of the highest value might be grasped by the lynx-eyed astronomer. The resolution of a nebula—the bisection of a

* We hope soon to hear of the successful use of the Rev. Mr. Craig's large achromatic refractor at Wandsworth, and of the conversion into a telescope of the magnificent disc of glass 29 inches in diameter, belonging to the Messrs. Chance at the Smethwick Glass Works.

* See *Report of British Association*, 1851, p. 21; and *Report of the Juries*, Class X., p. 251.

double star—the details of a planet's ring—the evanescent markings on its disc, or perhaps the display of some of the dark worlds of Bessel, might be the revelation of a moment, and would amply repay the transportation of a huge telescope to the shoulder or to the summit of a lofty mountain." At the Birmingham meeting of the British Association, in 1849, a resolution was passed to petition Government for a grant of money for the purpose of sending an astronomer to a southern climate with a reflector three feet in diameter. The Royal Society agreed to second this application, and an able memorial by Dr. Robinson was submitted to the Minister. From causes to which we would rather not allude, the application was unsuccessful; but as the British Association and the Royal Society have again combined to apply to the Government, we have strong grounds for believing that the necessary funds will be granted. The committee appointed to carry out this scheme have named Professor Piazza Smyth as highly qualified to take charge of the telescope, and he has agreed to accept of the appointment on three conditions, of which we do not hesitate to express our warmest approbation. The first is, that he shall be consulted respecting the construction of the instrument; 2d, that the telescope shall not be inferior to any that have yet been made; and 3d, that it shall be placed at a height of nearly 10,000 feet above the level of the sea. To these conditions the committee and the Government will doubtless agree, and in a few years we may expect results doing honour to our country, and extending widely the boundaries of Astronomy.

6. *Remarks on the Indian Civil Service.* By SIR E. T. COLEBROOKE. London, 1852.

THE East Indian Company is not merely a "great" fact; it is a gigantic one. Two centuries and a half ago, a little party of London merchants, meeting chiefly at the house of a worthy citizen and alderman named Goddard, subscribed, in sums ranging from £100 to £3,000, a capital of £30,000, for the purchase and equipment of a ship to trade with the Far Indies. The great success of the Portuguese, and the dawning prosperity of the Flemings in the Indian seas, had excited the commercial cupidity and stimulated the mercantile activity of the compatriots of Drake and Raleigh; and now, just as the sixteenth century was in the agony of dissolution, these London traders, headed by the Lord Mayor, determined to make a stroke to secure for themselves and their country a share of the fabulous wealth to be derived from a continual traffic with the spice-islands of the Indian Ocean and the Kingdom of the Great Mogul.

The sum subscribed is barely sufficient for the support of a Governor-General in the present day. But from that little subscription, and from those meetings of a few London citizens at Alderman Goddard's house, sprung our present Indian Empire, with its revenue of twenty-six millions sterling, and its hundred and twenty millions of inhabitants.

We who belong to this expansive generation, and live in the present age of wonders, think nothing of these things. We look at British India on the map, read letters from our friends at Prome and Peshawur, visit the great house in Leadenhall Street, solicit cadetships for our sons, and take things as we find them, without a feeling of astonishment or awe. We know that it all is so; and are content with the knowledge. We do not trouble ourselves to wonder about it. But, if Mr. Thomas Kerridge, the first "chief" of the Company's factory at Surat, or Sir Thomas Roe, the Lord Ambassador, whom King James despatched to the Court of the Great Mogul, were, with supernatural range of vision, to look down on our present mighty Indian Empire, to see his descendants cantoning at the furthest point of the kingdom of Lahore, and quietly "annexing" the great province of Pegu; white men everywhere between these two points, drilling soldiers, administering laws, lording it over the Gentoos with absolute rule and authority; the Great Mogul himself scarcely a pageant, the wreck or shadow of a pageant, a feeble reminiscence of royalty, whining for more pay—the whole country bristling with

ART. VIII.—1. *Minutes of Evidence on Indian Affairs, taken before Select Committee of the House of Lords.* 1852.

2. *Minutes of Evidence taken before Select Committee of the House of Commons.* (With an Appendix.) 1852.

3. *Modern India: a Sketch of the System of Civil Government; to which is prefixed some Account of the Natives and Native Institutions.* By GEORGE CAMPBELL, Esq., Bengal Civil Service. London, 1852.

4. *Remarks on the Affairs of India; with Observations on some of the Evidence given before the Parliamentary Committees.* By JOHN SULLIVAN, Esq. London, 1852.

5. *Contributions to the Statistical Society of London.* By Col. W. H. SYKES, Vice-President. v.d.

fortresses raised by the very people who in his time could not obtain a rood of land to build upon—and the few princes not absolutely absorbed or extinguished, only making a dim show of independence, existing by suffrance of the paramount European power, and waiting with fear and trembling the inevitable day when the “resident” who rules at their Courts, and the “contingent” which overawes them, will become openly, as they now virtually are, the administrative and protective machinery of the Company itself. If Mr. Thomas Kerridge, we say, or Sir Thomas Roe, were now to look down on this great revolution, it may be doubted whether either the Chief Factor, or the Lord Ambassador would ever cease from giving utterance to the exclamations of the “Bailie Nicol Jarvie” and the “Dominie” of our own great national novelist—“Ma conscience!”—“Pro-di-gious!”—unto the end of time.

There is matter for profound thoughtfulness in all this. Passing *per saltum* from the small beginning to the mighty end, it is wonderfully suggestive of those truths which it most concerns us to accept with humble reverence and cherish with deep affection. But more suggestive still than the spectacle of the great result is the history of the process by which the little factory at Surat grew into the British-Indian Empire. That empire has become what it is in defiance of all human calculations, and in spite of all human efforts. It has been the unceasing endeavour of the East India Company to prevent the expansion of their territories. From the time when having no territory they were eager to limit the number of their factories, and did all that they could do to curb the military ardour of their servants, and to keep before their eyes, clear and unclouded, the fact that they were sent out only to trade, up to these days, when, as we believe, the acquisition of new territory forced upon them by the Burmese war is regarded as a great calamity, the Company have unceasingly counselled and attempted to enforce *compression*. But the British-Indian empire was not to be compressed. There was a principle of expansiveness within it which no human power could control. A list of the Company's covenanted servants in India could once be written on a page of note-paper: it now fills an octavo volume. But earnestly and consistently have the Company endeavoured to keep down this rapid growth of dominion. With fortresses and with armies they desired and strove to have no concern. They never dreamt of establishing principalities in India—of conquering native states and ruling native tribes—of sending out soldiers

and law-givers to Hindostan. All they thought of was the carrying on of business, as they phrased it, on “a pure mercantile bottom.” They loaded their vessels with English goods, for sale, if they could be sold—though often the report was, that our commodities would “not vend among the Gentiles,” and brought home the rich produce of the Indies to be dispersed among our own people, or to be exported to neighbouring states. When one of their servants—Mr. Day—took upon himself to commence the erection of a fort at Madras, he was severely censured by the Company, who wondered what right he had to put them to charges for such unprofitable work. The increase of their “dead stock” was a constant source of complaint with them. They protested against the unthrif of locking up their capital in public buildings, which yielded no return; and seemed desirous that their factors should have the lightest possible hold upon the soil. They wished them, indeed, to live with “one foot on sea and one on shore;” and to be able to depart from the different places of trade, at a moment's notice, without any sacrifice of public property—any abandonment of dead stock. But, in spite of all this, little by little, our factories struck root in the soil, and whilst everything, humanly speaking, seemed to be against the extension of trade, and the establishment of empire, we were everywhere extending our trade, and laying the foundation of a mighty empire.

The very discouragements and disasters, indeed, which seemed to threaten the extinction of our trade, and the entire severance of our connexion with India, wrought mightily in our favour, and preserved the Company from the destruction which would assuredly have descended on their monopoly, if they had been irresistibly carried forward on the wings of dominant success. The rapid growth of the Portuguese empire in India had been the natural forerunner of its rapid decline. The extraordinary success which attended the first efforts of the Lusitanian conquerors inflated them with a boastful self-reliance, and urged them on to those excesses which precipitated their overthrow. The Portuguese settlements were filled with desperate adventurers, whose undisguised licentiousness dishonoured alike their country and their religion. They were bound by no laws, and restrained by no scruples. For a while the recklessness of their conduct overawed the timid natives of India, and their swollen insolence carried everything before it. But this great empire, reared by violence and oppression, was corrupt to the very core; and, in God's good

time, it perished by the innate force of its own corruptness. It seemed impossible, in the early days of our connexion with India, that we should ever supplant this mighty European power, which had erected for itself a great eastern empire, at a time when the Far Indies were to us almost as the regions of dreamland, fabulous, indistinct; but the "braggart Portugals," as our early English settlers were wont to call them in their quaint old English despatches, have long since ceased to occupy any other than the lowest place in the varied family of Indian inhabitants. They have been stripped of all national importance. They have lost even the dignity of successful crime. They are a scattered, servile people; no longer proud warriors and gorgeous merchant-princes, but drummers, fiddlers, cooks, tavern-keepers, petty traders. Nationally, their degradation is complete. Whilst the English, whose people they persecuted, and whose trade they obstructed, lord it over the whole continent of India from Peshawur to Pegu.

It is hard to say how much, under Providence, we owe to these very persecutions and obstructions. There were adventurers enough in England, during the early days of our Indian trade—the gallants of Paul's Walk, and the returned desperadoes of the Flemish wars—to have overrun with their bloated licentiousness, the southern and western coasts of India, and to have held temporary possession of many tracts of country by the power of the sword. But the tidings which our merchant-ships brought home were tidings of little but failure. The trade was unpopular in England. In India it seemed to be disastrous. There were all sorts of dangers and difficulties in our way—much to deter; nothing to encourage. If, occasionally, a young gentleman sailed out to India, without a covenant with the Company, he spent a few wretched months in India, returned home disappointed and disgusted, and reported that there was nothing to be got in the country but fevers, fluxes, serpent bites, and bad diet. As an open region for general adventure, nothing was to be made of it. Even the trade was not profitable. So many difficulties and obstructions beset it—there were so many jealous enemies to encounter, and so many deceitful friends to escape—that the general body of the mercantile community were slow to covet a share of it; and so the Company's monopoly was either tolerated by the people, or so feebly opposed, that the opposition had no permanent effect upon the interest of the great corporation. The vehement success

of the Portuguese had been their ruin. The immigration into India of thousands of European adventurers had caused an unwholesome growth of empire. The Lusitanian power outgrew its strength. It had the dimensions without the wisdom and restraint of mature manhood; and its successes hurried it into a rapid decline. There is no reason to think that a like copious immigration of English adventurers would not have been followed by the same retributory results. Our slow success at the outset preserved the Company from extinction, and it is, under Providence, to the preservation of the Company, that we owe our British empire in the East.

The more closely we study the history of British India, whether in its early or later periods of progressive advancement, the more apparent becomes the fact, that all the adverse circumstances which, from time to time, have threatened the extinction first of our trade, then of our empire, in the East, have tended greatly to increase the extent and the stability of both. It is a trite remark, that in the lives of individual men, the elements of eventual happiness and prosperity are often to be found in those very discouragements and disasters which, at the time of their occurrence are bewailed with an intensity of passion, as though they were special marks of God's displeasure. The remark is a trite, because it is a true one, such as most men's experience confirms. And, as with men, each in his individual unity, so with men in the concrete—with communities—with nations—the elements of their ultimate prosperity are often to be found in their early disasters. That which seems to human comprehension of all things the least likely to promote success, is often the chief agent of our successes. We arrive at the goal after all, but by a road in no way resembling that which we purposed to traverse. Our own designs are set at nought. Our own wisdom is shown to be mere foolishness. Our ends are shaped by a higher power. Strength is drawn out of weakness—success out of failure. His ways are not our ways. There are many great lessons to be learnt from history; but none greater than this.

It is in the mood of mind which such considerations as these naturally induce, that the history of British India ought to be studied. The hand of God is never so clearly visible in human events as when there is this seeming antagonism between the cause and the effect. Certainly, no human architect would have thought of building up a great empire after such a fashion as this. Of all the three great European

powers which, at the commencement of the seventeenth century, were contending for the rich traffic of the East, it seemed to human eyes as though the English were the least likely to obtain supremacy in the Indian seas. To the gross vision of men, persecutions, buffetings, and humiliations, such as we were condemned to suffer in our infancy, seemed to portend anything but a manhood of lusty vigour—a life of victory and triumph. It is only by a distinct recognition of the shaping hand of the great divine Architect, that we can reconcile this mighty inconsistency—or rather make it wholly disappear. There can be nothing more beautiful and harmonious than such a scheme, when we once come to understand it. It is in exact accordance indeed with all that we learn from revelation about the “ways of God to man.”

The subordination of the mighty continent of India, with all its millions of inhabitants, to a handful of white men from an obscure island on the northern seas, is so prodigious a fact, that any man, not an atheist or an idiot, regarding it for the first time in all its significance, would exclaim at once that Providence, for some special purpose, had ordained this seeming inversion of the laws which ordinarily govern human affairs. It would be proclaimed aloud as a standing miracle—a monument of God’s power—and something of awe would mingle in the contemplation of so stupendous a fact. It would be well if we, in whose minds familiarity with this greatest wonder of the age may have bred something of irreverence, should sometimes endeavour to regard it with the eye of a stranger and the faith of a neophyte. For it is only by cherishing the conviction that God has entrusted the government of India to the British nation for some special purpose of His own, and that that purpose is a good and a wise one, connected with the furtherance of the ultimate happiness of the great family of mankind, that we can rightly understand our duties towards India, and enter, without the certainty of groping painfully in the dark, and stumbling over many grievous errors, upon the consideration of the great questions of the past and future government of the countless millions who have submitted themselves patiently to our rule.

We confess that we are not of the number of those who, looking for good in the government of the East India Company, see “all barren from Dan to Beersheba.” We confess that we are not of the number of those who see in the short-comings of the British a painful contrast to the “insatiable benevolence” of the Mahomedan kings.

Under these Mogul princes the people of India were subject to an unmingled despotism of the worst kind. It is true that some few of them erected great public works, and reared magnificent regal structures, and that one was a wise, liberal, and enlightened monarch, worthy to be placed in the front rank of the beneficent sovereigns of the world, and to be held in honour throughout all generations. But in all that line of great kings, from Tamerlane to Aurungzebe, we look in vain for another Acbar. His successor, whom we found on the Mogul throne, when we first made our way from Surat to the imperial city, was a feeble sensualist; and there was nothing in any part of the country to indicate the existence of a prosperous people. Our early travellers described the natives of India as “very poor Gentiles,” and the King as the richest monarch in the world. They reported that the country was infested with robbers, whom the smallest coin would tempt to the commission of crime, that life and property were so insecure, especially when civil war was rending the land, (and the country was seldom without the burden of that deadly evil,) that men buried their money in the earth lest it should be violently taken from them, and their heads pay the penalty of complaint. Looking at the Mogul monarchy from first to last, one sees nothing but convulsive throes and spasms of beneficence, dependent upon the personal character of the reigning prince, and not communicable even to his satraps. There were no fixed and recognised principles of action, there was no such thing as the restraining power of public opinion. Legal authority and regal pleasure were convertible terms. Every man in office was a little king, and violated the law at his own convenience as bravely as though he had been a great one.

It is said that under the Mogul monarchies there was at least no governing caste, that high office under the crown was held alike by Mahomedans and Hindoos, but that since the country has passed under British rule all the high offices under government have been monopolized by the European invaders. The fact is very much as stated; but we deny the inference which some writers have drawn from it. It has been said that this monopoly renders our rule distasteful in the extreme to the great mass of the people, that they only tolerate our presence in India because they know that they have not power to eject us, and that so long as the avenue to official wealth and distinction is closed against them, this feeling of hatred will not cease to possess their souls. That we have, to a great ex-

tent, broken down the aristocracy of the country is not to be denied. But we must not confound the welfare of the aristocracy of the country with the welfare of the great mass of the people. The question is not whether the few, but whether the many have suffered by the substitution of the British for the Mahomedan yoke. We have not ourselves been able to discover that the people of India profited much by the wealth and influence of the oligarchy under the Mussulman rule. Indeed, our researches would lead us rather to believe that the old aristocrats, whose decadence some intelligent writers so much deplore, were an extremely selfish and rapacious class of men, who persecuted the weak without remorse, and oppressed them without compunction, and who set both law and justice at defiance when they had ends of their own to serve. But from the Christian gentlemen who have taken the place of the old native office-bearers, the poorest peasant in the land is secure of obtaining both law and justice. There is not a ryot in the Company's dominions who may not bring an action against the Company in the Company's courts, and if his case be a good one, he may not only bring but gain it. "The Englishman at home," says an intelligent writer to whose pen we are indebted for much varied information illustrative of the working of the Indian governments, "whose rights are fenced and guarded by so many barriers against the inroad of arbitrary power—irremovable judges, democratic institutions, and popular opinion—will doubtfully ask what chance a poor native farmer, or penniless suitor, would have of success in a contest with the government of India, a government that is based upon military power, with all its officers for the administration of civil justice, from those of the highest court of appeal down to the district moonsiffs, removable at pleasure, and without juries as a counterpoise to its influence?" And this important question he thus answers,—supporting the general affirmation by a mass of statistical details,—“The government allows itself to be sued in its own courts—courts established by itself, and capable of being abolished at its own pleasure. It allows appeals against itself from court to court, and finally to the Privy Council in England; and itself, in a similar manner, appeals against the decisions of its own judges. It provides even that suitors, in *forma pauperis*, may litigate their rights against itself and others; and its own superintendent and remembrancer of legal affairs for Bengal not only recommends the remission of sums debited against paupers, but thinks that

(with certain exceptions) government ought to forego the stamp duty on all pauper suits;”* and that this popular right, to sue the government of the country, is in effect no dead letter, may be sufficiently gathered from the fact that upwards of five hundred suits against government are instituted in a year.

We have quoted the words of Colonel Sykes, because, although himself a director of the East India Company, he is understood to be a man of extreme candour and liberality, utterly destitute of that national egotism which tricks so many of us into the belief that what appertains to or emanates from our own country, must of necessity be both comparatively and positively good, and that, therefore, to India and her people the supremacy of Great Britain must be an un-mixed benefit. Indeed, on this very question of the advantages and disadvantages of the Mogul rule, it is probable that Colonel Sykes would have much more to say in favour of the rulers whom the Company supplanted than we could bring ourselves to endorse. In the above passages, therefore, we regard him as the most unprejudiced witness. And how weighty and significant they are. Was there any such liberty as this enjoyed by the people under the Mahomedan rule? That the aristocracy have suffered by our intrusion, we admit, for we have deprived them of the power of outraging justice, and violating law at discretion. But, unless it can be shewn that liberty and justice are no blessings to a people, it would be difficult to find, in the existence of a native aristocracy, any amount of advantage to outweigh the substantial blessing of such protection as this. Security is no small thing. An old Jemadar of one of the Company's regiments, who was taken prisoner in the first Burmese war, told the British Commissioner, on being released at Yandaboo, that the Burmese chiefs had often pressed him to enter their service, and asked him, on his refusal, why he preferred that of the British. He always, he said, returned the same answer—"I will tell you why—Because among the English there is no one who can say 'Take away this fellow and cut off his head.'"

Much has been said about the "great public works of the Mahomedans." The "great imperial works" would be a more fitting expression. We cannot think much of the "insatiable benevolence" of those rulers who erected no hospitals for the sick.

* Colonel Sykes on the "Statistics of Civil Justice in Bengal, in which the Government is a party."—*Journal of the Statistical Society of London.*

Before the dominion of the English was established there were hospitals for sick brutes, but none for sick men. There were, however, we admit, very gorgeous palaces, and cenotaphs of undeniable beauty. If these were public works the Mogul Emperors are entitled to all praise for their construction. But, in what way did they benefit the people? There were roads, too, in the direction of the Emperor's country-seats and hunting grounds, and vast reservoirs in the neighbourhood of their palaces. The people may have received some benefit from these, but they were not constructed for the people. It would seem, too, from certain old edicts still extant, that forced labour was employed in the construction of these works; and it is certain that the imperial progresses were hailed with anything but delight by the inhabitants of the districts through which the mighty cortège made its way. India is strewn with the remains of noble structures, indicating a state of by-gone grandeur not to be contemplated without some mournful feelings—for the decay of the beautiful in nature or art is always sad—but a closer examination of these works soon convinces the inquirer that only a very minute portion of them conferred the least benefit on the people. They are monuments only of the gorgeous selfishness of the Moguls.

It is not altogether beside the mark thus briefly to inquire, as we have done, into the merits of the government which we supplanted. The Moguls, though they had more in common with the Hindoos, and fused themselves, as we have never done and never can do, into the general mass of Indian society, were like ourselves aliens and usurpers. We have endeavoured to show that we inflicted no great wrong upon the people of India by substituting one usurpation for another. Even as regards the physical advantages resulting from the rules, it would seem the merest perverseness to give the preference to the dominion of the Moguls. But the great question to be considered is the extent to which, not comparatively, but positively, we have fulfilled the duties entrusted to us by an over-ruling providence, or failed in their fulfilment. In all such considerations, we need scarcely say, regard must be had to the circumstances which have either aided or impeded the fulfilment of these duties. We must be judged according to our opportunities. We have been for two centuries and a half connected with India by ties of commerce. But less than a century has elapsed since that territorial connexion commenced, which entailed upon us the duty of governing any portion of the people. When the Dewance first passed into our hands we

were content to suffer the machinery of native administration to work on very much as it had always worked under the Soubahdar. But little by little we began to insinuate ourselves into the executive government of the provinces which had been ceded to us, until both the fiscal and judicial departments of the administration passed openly into our hands. If the English gentlemen, who had all their lives been busied only with investments, were at first no very consummate craftsmen in this new work of civil administration,—if our functionaries, suddenly transported from the counting-house to the Cutcherry, did not make crack collectors or learned judges at the outset of their new career, the wonder would have been if any other result had signalized such a transition. They were but novices, and it is certain that they had not been bred in a good school. There were, doubtless, some honourable exceptions to the general rule; but the contemporaries of Verelst and Vansittart, or even of Hastings and Barwell, were not bright examples of benevolence, and the welfare of the natives of India had little place in their thoughts.

But the new era commenced with the government of Lord Cornwallis. Something of this may not unjustly be attributed to the personal character of this benevolent nobleman. But, at this time, both among the Directors of the Company at home and their servants in India, an improved tone of feeling, caught from the improved social morality of our own country, was beginning to manifest itself in their public acts. Cornwallis had the aid of many able and excellent men, foremost among whom were Shore and Barlow: and the work of law-making in good earnest commenced. It was their desire to systematize both the fiscal and judicial administration of the country, and to mitigate the despotic character of the government as it existed in the time of their predecessors. Defects there may have been in these famous "Regulations,"—though the English Judges, Jones and Chambers, pronounced them to be well-nigh perfect,—but it would be mere malignity to deny the good intentions of the framers. Their main object was to give security to the people—not to abolish their laws, to overthrow their institutions, to interfere with their ancient customs and usages, but to establish them securely in all these, and to afford them the means of obtaining redress against any infringement of them either by private individuals, by the officers of the Government, or by the Government itself. The reformation then introduced conferred on the people of India the benefit of a clearly defined written law, and protected them against the arbitra-

ry decisions of unjust or incompetent tribunals by decreeing the printing and publishing of all laws, and ordering the courts of judicature to be guided only by the laws so printed and published. This, in itself, was a great step in advance; although such publicity, as regards the great mass of the people, must always be a dead letter. In all countries it would be the same. Here laws are made for the people; but the people know nothing of them *in posse* or *in esse*. They leave the manipulation to their representatives, who perhaps do not know much more. In India, where the representative system does not obtain, the draft of every act is published for general information and general criticism. Public bodies, official functionaries, public journalists, private individuals, are all constructively invited to criticise the labours of the legislative department of Government. And it has sometimes happened that the literature of the Government Gazette has been so severely handled by the public that its authors have taken the hint and abandoned their offspring to the popular discontent.

We are aware that Mr. Campbell, whose valuable work on "Modern India" is now before us—a work which contains more authentic information relative to the civil government of the country than any volume with which we are acquainted—has given a very different account of Lord Cornwallis' measures of reform. "The instructions given to Lord Cornwallis," he says, "were—to put the revenue on a regular and permanent footing, and in the administration of justice to conform rather to 'subsisting manners and usages of the people, than to abstract theories.' Of these instructions he overdid the one and altogether reversed the other." That is, he conformed to abstract theories rather than to the manners and usages of the people. And in another passage he says, "He (Lord Cornwallis) altogether ignored the institutions of the country, gave no encouragement to decisions out of court and avoidance of law-suits—to agreeing with a man's neighbour whilst in the way with him; rather encouraged all to come to the regular tribunals." But we hardly think that the case is here fairly stated. He certainly did not "ignore the institutions of the country." The judicial regulations were drawn up by Mr., afterwards Sir George Barlow, one of the ablest civilians in the country, who never ceased to declare to the day of his death, half a century afterwards, that so far from ignoring the institutions of the country, it had been the intent of the new system to respect them, to secure the people in all their ancient

rights and usages, and to protect them against the arbitrary exercise of authority which the loose unrecorded style of judicature which Lord Cornwallis found in vogue on his arrival in the country was too surely calculated to encourage. We entirely concur with Mr. Campbell in opinion, that there is too much system—too much form—too much intricacy in the mode of determining suits in the law courts established in the Regulation provinces of India. But that Lord Cornwallis' reforms, either fiscal or judicial, were, as Mr. Mill has broadly stated and as Mr. Campbell believes, the hasty effusions of an inexperienced English aristocrat, knowing nothing and caring nothing about native institutions, rights and usages, all true history clearly denies. Shore and Barlow were not experienced English aristocrats, nor men likely to ignore the institutions of the country, and *they* were the real authors of the measures which bear Lord Cornwallis' name.

But whatever may be the tendency of the Regulations of 1793, they are, after the lapse of sixty years, still in active operation. They are now, says Mr. Campbell, "the first on the Indian statute-book, and remain in force unless altered by subsequent enactments: the greater part still subsists to the present day. A regular series of regulations was henceforth published, and the acts of government of all functionaries were regulated by these published laws, and were liable to be judicially called in question for their violation or misconstruction." In other words, the Government of India ceased to be a pure despotism. If the new code interfered with any existing rights of the natives, it conferred upon them rights such as they had never enjoyed before. It removed them beyond the reach of that arbitrary exercise of power—"the oppressor's wrong, the proud man's contumely"—to which they had been habituated from generation to generation, and against which it seemed hopeless to struggle. It emancipated them from a state of serfdom, which was not merely a name; and gave every man within the limits of the Company's dominions the power of pushing a suit even against the Company itself, before the ultimate tribunal of the Privy Council of Great Britain. At all events a great principle was here established. The judicial system of Lord Cornwallis conferred civil liberty upon the people of India, and gave the poorest ryot the same legal rights as the proudest soubahdar.

The Cornwallis system, we repeat, may not be free from inherent defects, but, in spite of all these defects, it is not, without a display of bitter prejudice, to be denied,

that under the government of this benevolent nobleman, the civil administration of India assumed a more liberal and enlightened character, and was purged of much of the corruption that had tainted it in the time of his predecessors. There can be no comparison in this respect between India as it was in the time of Warren Hastings, and as it is in the present day; and yet the administration is now substantially the same as that which was initiated under the government of Lord Cornwallis. We then began really to govern India and to bethink ourselves of the welfare of the people. But, unhappily, we had something else to do at this time. Following up the well-intentioned administrative efforts of his predecessors, Lord Wellesley might have done much for the people, but there was the integrity of the frontier to be preserved, insolent enemies to be chastised, principalities to be prostrated and absorbed, new countries to be settled. The time of this great statesman was almost wholly occupied with what in India is called "political" business, that is, the work of the diplomatist. "He does not seem," says Mr. Campbell, "to have originated much in the system of domestic management, and altogether in *internal* affairs I should say that he was not a great Governor-General. He principally followed in the footsteps of Lord Cornwallis. He was probably too much engaged in warlike and political schemes." These warlike and political schemes greatly disquieted the Company. Against all this extension of empire they steadfastly set their face. The British Government and the British people adopted the same pacific views; and the extension of our Indian Empire was declared illegal by Act of Parliament. But all the united efforts of Leadenhall Street and Westminster—all that the "City" Courts and the "West-end people" could do, availed not to control that principle of expansiveness which governed our Indian Empire. As in the early days of British connexion with the East, in spite of every effort to maintain no other than mercantile relations with the people—in spite of all sorts of recommendations and exhortations against land-owning and fort-building, and the accumulation of dead stock, we struck root in the soil—as our Indian Empire was first established in spite of ourselves, so it was extended in spite of ourselves. We did not desire its extension, but for a century, under rulers of every possible shade of character—under warlike civilians and pacific soldiers—it went on increasing and increasing, and has not yet reached its limits.

It is a common thing to cry out against

the Company's lust of dominion; but there never was a government less greedy of conquest. We have seen a smile of incredulity on the lips even of intelligent men, when it has been asserted that such acquisitions as those of the Punjab have been forced upon us. But the history of India read aright exhibits a long series of wars, which our Indian statesmen have shrunk from as overwhelming calamities—wars which we have been compelled to prosecute in self-defence, and to have avoided which would have been alike disastrous and disgraceful. This great scheme of Indian conquest has been one of other and higher designing than our own. Its results remain yet to be seen. "There are many kinds of war," says a modern historian, "and many degrees of heroic renown; but the highest praise is due to those who, by their victorious arms, have opened new scenes for civilisation, and overcome barbarism in some important part of the world." It is hardly yet to be asserted, without something of self-glorification, that this "highest praise" is due to us; but we have made some efforts to deserve it. Until the conqueror has ceased from his labour, the civilizer must struggle on, clogged and fettered, with halting steps. Hitherto we have enjoyed only brief intervals of repose—we have seldom been able to turn our backs upon the neighbouring states, and concentrate all our thoughts upon affairs of internal administration. When, therefore, we come to consider the amount of good that has been done for India by the Company and their servants, and judge them according to the results, we must keep steadily before us the great fact, that we have been all this time constructing, as it were, the outer walls of the vast edifice of our Indian empire, and have had but little time and little money to furnish it with the good deeds of domestic improvement.

Mr. Campbell says that the Indian Government got a bad name in the time of Warren Hastings, and have never since contrived to re-embellish their tarnished reputation. "The hard thing is," he writes, "that the ancient accident of Hastings' persecution having given it a bad name, that bad name sticks to it to the present day; and with all its sacrifices, unjustifiable sacrifices, of legitimate revenue, it is still popularly believed in England to be harsh, grasping, and extortionate; and any idle or malicious agitator, or newspaper vendor, or hired advocate, has but to trump up the most improbable story of oppressed ryots, excluded rajas, or ill-used commissariat contractors, and it is greedily swallowed by a large portion of the public. Such is the misfortune of a bad name, and so little the profit of foolishly

sacrificing the means of doing real good." What Mr. Campbell means is, that the Company have been somewhat too eager to grant compensation to the native princes, whom the retention of British rule has ingulfed, and have saddled themselves with pensions, which now press very severely on the Indian finances, and, therefore, necessarily limit our expenditure on works of public improvement or social regeneration. But if the Company have erred in this, the error is on the right side. Whatever may be our opinion of the relative advantages to the people of India of native and British rule, it is certain that the native princes have suffered grievously by the establishment of our dominion, and that, although their own offences—their own treachery and hostility—may, in most cases, have precipitated their overthrow, they are still entitled to the compassion of their conquerors. It is only the part of a generous enemy so to regard the fallen. We admit that the evil is great—we have taken upon ourselves the entire cost of governing certain extensive provinces, from which, so long as they are burdened with the pensions of their old rulers, or the descendants of those rulers, we only derive a portion of the revenue. We pay out large sums of money to support the selfish luxury of a number of idle and unworthy men. But this is the accident of our position; and we do not know how the Company could escape from it, without really deserving the reproaches which have unjustly been heaped upon them.

It would appear from the Company's last general finance letter, given in the Appendix to the Commons' Report on Indian Territories, that in the last estimated year, 1850-51, the sum paid from the Indian treasury for these pensions, stipends, &c., amounts to 2,38,42,505 rupees, or nearly two millions and a half of English money. From a sense of justice, or from a feeling of compassion, this large sum is distributed among the Princes and Chiefs, who have been reduced to dependence and to poverty by the establishment of the universal rule of the Company; and we cannot say that we should like to see the item blotted out of the Indian balance-sheet. It is, doubtless, an awkward sum to pay. A small deficit on the gross accounts of the Company would become a large surplus if it had not to be paid. But the exemption would be dearly purchased. It is nothing to the point that the Company's forbearance is but imperfectly understood—that their policy is said to be grasping and their conduct rapacious, in spite of this exercise of clemency. Candid and enlightened men do not apply these epithets to the Com-

pany. That there is a vast amount of ignorance in the country, relative to the general character of British rule in the East, we regretfully admit. The Company themselves, we are inclined to believe, are partly responsible for this. They have not been sufficiently jealous of their own reputations. One of their own servants, Mr. John Stuart Mill, a gentleman known to the many as a philosophic writer, to the few as one of the assistant-examiners at the India House—expressed before the Committee of the House of Lords his belief, that no Government in the world takes so little trouble to justify itself, directly or indirectly, through the medium of the press, as the Government of the East India Company; in fact, that it is altogether the "best abused" Government under the sun. And yet a highly intelligent writer like Mr. Campbell accuses the Government of want of moral courage, in not daring to take, without any abatement, the revenues of the countries they have conquered. Mr. Campbell is, perhaps, a little too much of an annexationist—a little too much of an absorptionist. But it is not to be denied that the Company have seriously crippled their finances, and limited their means of internal improvement, by rejecting that grasping policy, and abstaining from that rapacious conduct with which they are so recklessly charged by writers and speakers, who either do not care to possess themselves of the truth, or do care maliciously to outrage it.

We believe that in this matter the East India Company have acted righteously; and, except in so far as under the operation of time, a gradual reduction may be effected in the amount of pensions and stipends paid to the native Princes and Chiefs, we would not wish to see the financial position of the Company improved by the excision of this very troublesome item of "general charges" from their yearly account. The great desideratum is a reduction of those monstrous items known as "extraordinary military charges," and "excess during war" of ordinary military charges. In the twelve years, from 1839-40 to 1850-51 inclusive, these charges amounted to nearly twenty-nine millions of our money. To this is to be added the increased interest on the increased debt, contracted in consequence of our extensive military operations, amounting during that series of years to nearly six millions more of our English money. In the year 1836, soon after the commencement of the present charter, the amount of the Indian debt was less than thirty millions. In 1850 it was forty-seven millions. How this was brought about is easily seen. "A rapid reduction,"

says the Company's last financial letter, "was effected in the debts from 1834 to 1836. This was accomplished by the application of a portion of the Company's commercial assets to that object. The large surplus revenue obtained in the three succeeding years, from 1835-6 to 1837-8, proportionately increased the Indian cash balances, and obviated the necessity of borrowing funds for the Afghan expedition. The debt was therefore not materially increased between the years 1836 and 1840. Towards the close of the year 1840-41, the cash balances had, however, fallen too low to sustain the heavy demands which continued to press on the treasury; recourse was therefore had to the money market. A five per cent. loan was accordingly opened in 1841, and closed in January 1843, upwards of five crores of rupees (millions of pounds) having been subscribed to it within that period. This supply had become necessary by the revolt in Caubul, in the winter of 1841, and the downfall of the power of Shah Soojah, which occasioned the most serious disasters to the British arms. Measures of retaliation in punishment for the treachery and murders committed by the Afghans, were promptly and successfully executed by our army within the following year, 1842. The war with Scinde, which had likewise occurred, having also terminated, your government were enabled to close the five per cent. loan. Affairs having thus assumed a brighter aspect, you (the Indian government) considered, that the deficiency which still continued, though reduced in amount, might be supplied by a loan bearing a lower rate of interest. A new four per cent. loan was accordingly advertised, and kept open from February 1843 to October 1846, the produce of which was about two and a-half crores of rupees. Supplies being, however, more urgently required for the new Sikh war than could be obtained for this rate of interest, you were compelled to re-open the five per cent. loan, and you continued to receive subscriptions, at this rate of interest, to the 7th April 1851, being two years after the annexation of the Punjab to the British dominions. The subscriptions, from the re-opening of the five per cent. loan, in October 1846, to its closing in April 1851, amounted to eight and a half crores of rupees. It will be observed that the increase of debt between the year 1839, when the expenses of the Afghan war pressed so heavily on the finances, and the commercial assets had become exhausted, and the year 1850, when the Punjab war had terminated, amounted to £16,676,902, of which

five-sixths was borrowed at an interest of five per cent."

This is the Company's official account of the progress of their pecuniary embarrassments since the commencement of that unjust and calamitous war which buried our soldiers by thousands, and our treasure by millions, in the deep defiles of Afghanistan. At the commencement of what is still known as "the present charter," the financial position of the Company was easy and encouraging. The abandonment of the China trade had given them that great desideratum of nations and of men—"money in hand." Lord William Bentinck had reduced the expenses of the Company's establishment to a judicious minimum: there was peace everywhere around us: it seemed that a brighter day than the country had ever known was about to dawn upon India: sounder opinions and higher principles were beginning to regulate the measures of British administrators in the East: the claims of the people of the soil and the obligations of their Christian rulers were more distinctly recognised and better understood; and the man to whom Lord William Bentinck had handed over the reins of government was supposed to be laudably eager to promote the development of the resources of the country, to apply our surplus finances to great reproductive works, to encourage and more substantially to aid all well-directed schemes for the education of the people—in a word, to devote himself, heart and soul, to works of beneficence, whether tending to advance the commercial prosperity or the social regeneration of the country. But the great Afghan calamity stood up before him. There was no longer any money, there was no longer any time, for works of quiet beneficence. Every rupee in the treasury, every thought of the British ruler, was henceforth to be devoted to the prosecution of a war, the gigantic iniquity of which was only to be equalled by its astounding folly. The surplus was converted into a deficit. New loans were opened. The debt was swollen with alarming rapidity; and for a while a general paralysis descended upon the promised amelioration of the country.

The war in Sindh and the war in the Punjab followed. They were both, the one more directly than the other, the *sequelæ* of the war in Afghanistan; and those works of internal improvement, for which we looked so long with eager expectancy, were arrested for a longer space. There was then again a brief cessation of hostilities, and then far down at the opposite extremity of the great Indian world another war—a war

with the Burmese Empire—broke out to impede and embarrass us again. A previous war against the same barbarous power had cost us fifteen millions of money and more lives than we shall number, lest we should be charged with exaggeration. We gained by it a tract of country, the pestiferous exhalations of which for many years were so deadly that a large proportion of those who were compelled to serve there, left their bones on its marshy plains. The second Burmese war, it is understood, will be followed by the annexation of the great province of Pegu, the possession of which will, in all human probability, soon drive us into another war, to be followed by the appropriation of the whole of the Burmese Empire; and then, perhaps, the Kingdom of Siam will also be ingulfed. We may have obtained a final boundary on the north-west, but farther extension of empire towards the south-east seems to be inevitable, however much, humanly speaking, it is to be deplored.

It seems that since the commencement of the Company's present lease of the Indian Empire, an extent of territory, in different parts of India, amounting in all to 167,013 square miles, has been added to their dominions. This era includes a population estimated at 8,572,630 human beings; but it is not improbable that the calculation somewhat falls short of the fact. All this extension of empire makes the Company poorer than before. Newly acquired provinces are seldom or never productive. Take for example the case of Sindh. In the first financial year after its annexation, it cost the Company 67 lakhs of rupees, or £670,000, exclusive of the cost of the regular troops. The last estimate—that for 1850–51 shows a deficit of between 15 and 16 lakhs. But the Company write, "We are afraid that this is a more sanguine view than the expenditure of preceding years would justify us in adopting at present, as the cost of the province of Scinde, exclusive of the expense of the regular troops of the Scinde division of the army, which we estimate at 20 lakhs more at least."—And then they proceed to say that 20 lakhs (or £200,000) per annum may be assumed as the expense of maintaining Scinde, exclusive of the cost of the regular troops. The stipends of the fallen Ameers amount to three lakhs of rupees, which brings the cost of management and protection (without the charges of the regular army) to the sum of £170,000 in excess of the gross receipts. The annexation of Sattarah—a petty principality about which so much stir has been made—costs the "grasping" Company 3½

lakhs of rupees a-year. The Punjab, on the last estimated financial year, yielded, without reference to the cost of the regular troops, a surplus of 14½ lakhs of rupees. It is believed, however, that the expenditure, in succeeding years, will fall short of the amount estimated, and that the revenues on the other hand will increase, under the benign influence of an effective system of canal irrigation. We have given the results of the official calculations, which differ, in respect of the Punjabee balance-sheet, very materially from those of Mr. Campbell, who, in his able chapter on Finance, makes out a surplus of more than 130 lakhs of rupees, in favour of our new acquisition; and as this is precisely the amount of the gross revenue of the Punjab, in the Company's accounts, the discrepancy is the more astounding. The difference, however, between the two accounts is somewhat reduced, when it is seen that Mr. Campbell includes the revenue of the states acquired by the first war, and which are credited at 50 lakhs of rupees to the revenues of the N. W. Provinces. But as the expenses of the management are to be carried to account per contra, we can hardly estimate the balance at more than 35 lakhs of rupees, which being deducted from Mr. Campbell's 135, (or £1,359,440), leaves still a surplus of a hundred lakhs, whilst the Company estimate it at only fifteen. The fact is, that Mr. Campbell estimates the expense of managing the Punjab (that is, the country acquired by the last war) at £380,000, while the Company's financiers set it down at a sum exceeding £960,000.

How so accurate a writer as Mr. Campbell should have fallen into this error, is only intelligible on the supposition that being a vehement annexationist, his wish is father to the thought of the productiveness of the Punjab, and that he looks at the finances of this favoured country with as penetrating a vision as that which enabled Sir William Napier to discover the Sindh surplus, discernible as it is to no vulgar eyes. We can hardly afford, however, to enter into these details. Our object is, in this place, merely to show that the grasping propensities with which the Company are charged, enable them only to realize an absolute loss, whenever they are compelled to annex new territories to their already overgrown Empire, and that all these acquisitions have a tendency to swallow up the surplus revenue derived from the settled provinces, and to delay from time to time those measures of national improvement which increase the productiveness of the soil and the happiness of the people, and

at the same time contribute largely to the treasury of the state. No sooner are we beginning to think of that judicious expenditure of public money on a ceded or conquered country, which will enable it in time to cover the expenses of management, and to contribute to the general purposes of government, than a new war, followed by the annexation of a new province, swallows up all our money again, and the enrichment of the older possession is indefinitely postponed, whilst the younger is consuming all our substance and occupying all our thoughts. The money which we now might spend on the improvement of the Punjab, must be appropriated to the "annexation of Pegu."

When, therefore, we come to consider the internal administration of India, and to inquire what the Company and their servants have done to increase the prosperity of the country and ameliorate the condition of the people, it must never be forgotten that our Indian Empire has all this time been extending itself in every direction, and that its rulers have never, for any continued season of repose, been able to devote either time or money to purposes of uninterrupted domestic improvement. For more than half a century the unchanging tenor of the Company's instructions to their servants in India has been of the most pacific character. They have exhorted their rulers, ever in the same unvarying strain, to turn their backs upon all foreign states, and to centre their thoughts upon the internal amelioration of the country already in their hands. They have done this with as much sincerity as consistency—but always with the same unfortunate results. It is not that the Company is grasping. It is that their designs have been over-ruled, and that Providence has decreed that the integrity of the British Empire in the East shall not be accomplished until other countries and other people, than those with which we have desired to connect ourselves, shall have been brought under our rule.

But although the good results of our internal administration are scanty in comparison with what they would have been had we not been almost incessantly occupied with the work of external construction, and had not that enforced enlargement of empire consumed all our financial means, it is not to be concealed that they are all obstacles and impediments, fairly considered, sufficient to enable us to give an account of our stewardship, by no means to be rendered with shame. The Government of India has been, and is, a great experiment. We believe that it has been conscientiously made.

Doubtless, we have been precipitated into some errors, and the result of our efforts has often fallen short of the goodness of our intentions. But there is no signal aggregate of failure to deplore. We have done *something* at least for the benefit of the people. And it may be doubted whether any machinery of government to which that vast empire could be subjected, would act more beneficially than that which is at present in operation.

It is with no violent presumption we assert that not one of the many writers and speakers, who denounce the grasping policy of the East India Company, and declare them to be altogether unprofitable servants, believes that any other European power would govern India, with such benevolent intentions and such beneficent results, as the British conquerors to whom the country has been so inscrutably entrusted. What, for example, would be the condition of India under Russian rule? If our Eastern Empire is ever to fall into other hands, the hands which are to snatch it away from us are by common consent pronounced to be those of the Czar. Whilst we are writing this, a curious anecdote is related to us, illustrative of the feeling with which the moral and social improvement of the people would probably be regarded by our Northern rivals. A Russian prince, recently travelling in India, was conversing with one of our political officers on the subject of the suppression of *Suttee*—or the immolation of Hindoo widows. The English officer had recently been engaged, with all the ardour of a philanthropic mind, and the energy of a strong understanding, in the good work of endeavouring to persuade certain native chiefs to follow the example set in the British territories, and to suppress the horrid custom throughout the independent Rajpoot states. The Russian prince listened to the recital of the Englishman's endeavours and his earnest expressions of hope of eventual success; but instead of giving utterance to any admiration of the one, or any sympathy with the other, he said deprecatingly, that he thought it was a pity to interfere with anything so romantic; for that, in proportion as customs of this kind were suppressed, the natives of India would cease to be an interesting people. We can imagine the boundless astonishment of the humane English officer, and the revulsion of feeling which followed the first shock of surprise.

But we wish rather to speak of the positive merits of the British Indian Government, for, after all, it is little to the purpose to say that other European powers, in

probability, would not treat the natives of India half as well as ourselves. It is more to the purpose to assert that not one of our Crown colonies is so well governed as the Indian dependency, whose condition we are now considering; but even this is not the matter at issue. The Crown colonies have been notoriously misgoverned; and for no reason more than this, that the administration of our numerous colonial possessions is directed and controlled by men, who often, so far from being acquainted with all the numerous dependencies committed to their care, have no knowledge of any one of them. Now, we are afraid it must be said that incompetent men find their way to the Board of Control as often as they do to the Colonial office. Indeed, when a new Ministry is in course of construction, the Board of Control is often regarded as a sort of refuge for the destitute, in which candidates for office whose general claims are not to be denied, are frequently stowed away without any kind of reference to individual qualifications for the proper discharge of the duties of that special office. In fact, it would seem that a statesman cannot know too little about India to preside at the India Board. Within the last year there have been three Presidents of the Board of Control, not one of whom was qualified for the office by the antecedents of official life. There have been six Secretaries within the same space of time, only one of whom can be said to have been duly trained for the business of the India Board. The inference from this is, that the Ministers of the Crown, to whatsoever section of party they may belong, either regard the good government of India as a matter of small account, or have such unlimited faith in the ability and integrity of the Directors of the East India Company, that they conceive that any respectable statesman—any used-up Chancellor of the Exchequer or Master of the Mint, is good enough to play dummy at Cannon Row, and endorse the proceedings of the Court.

And in this latter view of the case, perhaps the judgment would not be an erroneous one. The Court of Directors of the East India Company is composed of twenty-four gentlemen, the majority of whom bring to the council-table of the India House a large amount of Indian experience. Many of them have earned for themselves niches in history, and contributed largely to the success of those measures which have built up our Indian empire on its present secure foundation. Under the present Charter Act, which has now nearly attained its legitimate age of twenty years, only one new Director has been elected of other than In-

dian antecedents. The Secretaries, men of high ability, have spent nearly all their lives in the India House, and are thoroughly acquainted with all the details of Indian administration. The stream of government flows on quietly and uninterruptedly, and in no devious channels. There are no abrupt transitions—no elimination of new speculative opinions. It is not a Whig Administration at Lady-day—a Tory at Midsummer—a coalition at Christmas. The principles of the Court of Directors have been substantially the same for the last fifty years—almost we might write, for the last century—modified and improved only by those influences, which the general progress of civilisation and Christianity bring to bear upon all governing bodies. The East India Company never has been—never can be—the representative of a party. It stands, indeed, an impassable barrier between Party and the distant millions who know not Whigs and Tories, Liberals and Conservatives, Free-traders and Protectionists, even by name. Party is a great enemy to good government. Ignorance is a still greater. The Directors of the East India Company are over-ridden and oppressed by neither. That the Government of our vast Indian possessions should be in the hands of men who know what is good for the country, and have no sinister motives to conceal or vitiate their knowledge, is surely a great thing. If then the Ministers of the day are careless of the matter of qualification in their Presidents and Secretaries of the Board of Control, because they recognise the high qualifications of the Court of Directors, and would leave the government of India entirely in the hands of that competent body, we are not sure that the judgment, upon which such practice is based, could be declared an erroneous one.

But incompetency and inactivity do not always go together. It by no means follows that an English statesman, because he knows nothing about India, will be, on that account, more willing to defer to the opinions of those who do. Indeed, in practice the very opposite of this is too often the apparent result. It requires some knowledge to enable a man to defer, at the right time, to the opinions of those who know more than himself. The most ignorant are often the most self-sufficient. Doubtless, men may be appointed to the chiefship of the Board of Control wanting sagacity or candour to recognise the vast experience and the high integrity of a Charles Grant, or the comprehensive intelligence and sturdy independence of a Henry St. George Tucker. In most cases, indeed, it will happen that the greater

the knowledge and experience in Cannon Row, the greater the deference that will be paid to the authority of the India House. We would much rather see at the India Board a competent and experienced Indian statesman, and we feel assured that the Directors of the East India Company would rather act in concert with such a statesman than with a new man sent to the Board of Control, because there is no convenient place for him elsewhere. Between the former and the Court of Directors there is likely to be less antagonism. It is no small thing to know when to interfere and when to abstain from interfering. We by no means desire to see the Ministerial element entirely omitted from the constitution of the Indian Government. We believe that the present mixed machinery of administration is the best that could be devised. But we claim that the importance of the trust should be duly regarded by our British Cabinets—that the Board of Control should not be used as a refuge for destitute Ministers, who have been tried in other departments and found wanting—that the East India Company should not be overridden by the ignorance and caprice of a man, who probably does not know whether a Rajah is a Hindoo or a Mussulman prince, who would look for Tanjore in the map somewhere on the banks of the Jumma, and wonder whether the Suddur Nizamut Adawlut were a Judicial or a Revenue Court. If it be desirable to vest the controlling authority in a Minister of the Crown—and with certain restrictions and modifications of the existing system we believe it to be desirable—it is surely expedient also that the controlling Minister should be selected on account of his qualifications for that especial office, and that those qualifications should not be lightly considered. In other words, if we are to have a President of the Board of Control at all, we have a right to ask for a competent one.

But from the levity, with which this important appointment is ordinarily made, we may at least derive one useful lesson. It is plain that the interests of India are very lightly regarded by the Ministers of the Crown; and that any greater infusion of the Ministerial or Home element into the constitution of the Indian Government, would therefore be extremely prejudicial to the interests of the country. It is very uncommon to see anything like a genuine manifestation of interest in an Indian question in either House of Parliament. A speech must occasionally be made, especially at certain epochs, when the “whirligig of Time” brings round the closing years of a Charter. But

how dull and lifeless it is—how full of the learning of hand-books and encyclopædias—how gravid with cut-and-dried details, strung together perhaps by the great man’s private secretary; and of commonplace opinions, such as any student at Haileybury or at the Hindoo College of Calcutta would express in an academical essay, with greater earnestness of purpose and greater vigour of style. Nothing of Indian parentage seems to excite any interest in our English Ministers but a war. And when there is a war in India, it is carried on by the Board of Control in concert with the Foreign Secretary and other colleagues. The Court of Directors, as a body, have nothing to do with it. They do not know anything about it. It is in what is called the “Secret Department;” and the business of the Secret Department is initiated by the Board of Control.

There is something in this war-making which stirs the apathetic and rouses the inactive; and we have no doubt that even an inert President of the Board of Control finds it very pretty pastime. But here it is that the obvious intent of the present mixed system of government seems to be frustrated in practice. It is intended that the Court of Directors of the East India Company should be a hinderance to the absolutism of the Board of Control, and that the Supreme Council of India should control the absolutism of the Governor-General of India. But the Governor-General leaves his council behind him—repairs to the neighbourhood of the seat of war, or otherwise isolates himself, and corresponds with the “Secret Committee,” which in fact is the Board of Control; whilst the latter authority makes peace or war, directs the assembling of armies and the annexation of provinces, and compels the members of the Secret Committee to sign the despatches he dictates. It is by the Court of Directors and by the Indian Councils that the real interests of India are best understood; it is in these bodies that the knowledge and experience necessary to such understanding is to be found. We should be glad, therefore, to see such a modification of the existing system, or rather such a practical recognition of the obvious intent of the Legislature in framing the present constitution of Indian government, as would bring this knowledge and experience fairly to bear not only upon questions of internal administration, but upon questions of peace and war. Some terrible warnings have been uttered. By a British statesman, regardless of the opinions of the East India Company, and by a Governor-General who had shaken off the trammels of his Council, the war in Afghanistan was made. Had the voice

either of Court or Council been sufficiently potential, that stupendous calamity would never have been written down in the mighty annals of the world.

We return then to the point from which we started, to repeat, that any diminution of the administrative power of the East India Company would be extremely injurious to the interests of the people of India. The Company have ever shown themselves eager to promote the internal welfare of their provinces, by husbanding their financial resources in such a manner as to provide an adequate surplus for the construction of those great reproductive works which so mightily contribute to the wealth of the country and the prosperity of the people. It is not fairly chargeable to them, that the Treasury of India has been drained by exhausting wars. What they have done for the people bears but a small proportion to what they would have done, if the limits of their empire had been attained, and the revenues had been at their disposal. As it is, therefore, we repeat that they must be judged with reference to the circumstances under which they have been compelled to act—circumstances over which, it is no unmeaning formula to say, “they have had no control.” They have not even now a settled frontier—they cannot even now devote themselves uninterruptedly to the good work of internal administration. But still what they have done, and are doing, whilst the boundary of their empire has been in process of extension, and new provinces have been passing under their rule, has been no light matter. The rhetorical taunt of Edmund Burke, which has been stereotyped for the use of his successors in invective, would not have been uttered at all if he had lived in these days; and yet it is repeated by men who will not remember, that though the words remain unchanged, the occasion of them has long passed away. Many noble monuments of our rule should we leave behind us if the last day of the expiring Charter were to be the last day of our Indian dominion.

The Parliamentary Committees, which have commenced their investigation of the great subject of Indian Government, have divided it into eight different heads of inquiry, which are thus particularized in their Reports:—

- “1. The authorities and agencies for administering the government of India at home and in India respectively.
2. The military and naval establishments of India—character, extent, and cost.
3. The income and expenditure of the British-Indian empire, shewing the produce of the territorial revenues and of all other

sources of income; and the modes of assessing and levying each in the respective territories and districts; also the progress of trade and navigation in India.

4. The judicial establishments of British India, European and native; the modes of administering justice, civil and criminal, and the working of the system as exhibited by tables of trials, appeals, and decisions.
5. The measures adopted, and the institutions established and endowed for the promotion of education in India.
6. Works of local improvement executed, in progress, and now under consideration.
7. Ecclesiastical provision for the diffusion of Christian spiritual instruction.
8. Miscellaneous topics of inquiry.”

Upon the first of these topics only has the investigation been brought to a close; and the result is, that the committees in both Houses have reported on the “favourable tenor of the evidence with respect to the operation of the Act 3 William IV., cap. 85, so far as it regards the administration of the government of India by the East India Company, as trustees under the control of the Crown.” It is mainly to this one leading topic of inquiry that we have hitherto directed our own attention. Mr. Campbell’s work on “Modern India” relates mainly to the machinery of government and the Company’s civil establishments in India. It is to future Parliamentary Blue-books that we must look for a detailed account of the ameliorative effects, physical and moral, of the Company, unless some experienced writer should undertake to produce a popular digest of the mass of information relating to these interesting matters, which will inflate the parliamentary folios to be looked for in the course of the year.

In the meanwhile, however, on a few of these great works we may briefly touch in the present place. A great deal of valuable information, which it is important to disseminate at the present time, has been thrown together by the intelligent officer at the head of the statistical department of the India House; and from these statistics we may gather some just idea of the principal material works which have been completed or commenced in India, since the present charter-act was passed by the British Legislature. In the list are to be found no magnificent public buildings—no mighty palatial edifices—no regal cenotaphs—no gorgeous specimens of ecclesiastical architecture. The new cathedral at Calcutta has sprung up within this time, but it is not to be accounted among the works of the East India Company. Indeed, it must be admitted, that for the embellishment of the

land, the Company have hitherto done little. Their works are of a plain, inornate character. They have the stamp of utilitarianism upon them, but they make very little show. The time has not yet come for the consideration of the Beautiful. But beautiful, doubtless, are the results of many of those useful works to which the Company have applied their finances, whenever they have had money to spend. There is nothing suggestive of picturesque associations in the two words, Roads and Canals. But they are mighty instruments of civilisation. Perhaps the Russian prince who bewailed our efforts to clear away the dense moral wilderness with which the people of India have for ages been surrounded, would also deplore our endeavours to conquer the material jungle and render it common-place and unpicturesque by improving the means of internal communication and fertilizing the land by an improved system of water supply. But if the English, driven from India by any great physical or moral revolution, should leave behind them only the great trunk road from Calcutta to Kurnaul—or, as it soon will extend, from Calcutta to Peshawer—and the great Ganges canal, it can never be said by a future Government, that they have left behind them no traces of beneficent rule.

The great Trunk Road from Calcutta to our north-western frontier—a metalled or Macadamized road—will in its integrity extend along a line of 1423 miles—965 of which have been already completed. The cost of construction has been estimated at £1000 per mile: and the annual outlay for keeping the whole in repair will be £50,000. Another great road from Bombay to Agra, and another from Calcutta to Bombay, are also in course of construction. The length of the former is 734 miles—that of the latter 1170. These roads are not Macadamized, except in particular parts. The cost of the former is estimated at £330 per mile, and the latter at £500. These calculations exclude the cost of convict labour, which is largely employed upon the work, and the salaries of the Company's regular servants who superintend them.

By these roads Agra, Bombay, and Calcutta are united; and from the former place a communication is opened up to the very borders of Afghanistan. But besides these great undertakings, a vast number of cross-roads have been constructed—everywhere facilitating the internal traffic of the country. A line of railway in each of the three Presidencies has been sanctioned, and already, under a government guarantee, are these great works in progress. It will be

no small thing in itself if a line of railways, uniting all the capitals of India, should remind a future generation of Hindoos that the science of the white man, on their trackless plains, annihilated time and space. But a work still more marvellous than this is about to bewilder the understandings of our untutored Indian subjects. The electric telegraph will soon be in active operation. Lines of wires connecting Calcutta, Madras, Bombay, Agra, Simla, and Lahore, will flash from one point to another the commands of Government, and the tidings of great events; and the shroffs in the Calcutta Bazaar, at a trifling cost, may convey intelligence to their correspondents, five hundred miles off, in less time than it now takes them to write a letter of advice.

But, perhaps, of all the material works which the English in India have constructed, there are none which will contribute more largely to the general improvement of the country, than our canals of irrigation in those fine provinces of upper India where the water-supply is precarious. A memorandum on this subject, prepared in the Statistical Department of the India House, contains so much that it is important and interesting to know, that we transcribe it entire:—

“The whole volume of water from the rivers of the Himalayas, available for irrigation, has been estimated at about 24,000 cubic feet per second in the dry season, viz. :—

Ganges,	6,750
Jumna,	2,870
Ravee,	3,000
Chenaub,	5,000
Sutlej at Rooper,	2,500
Jhelum,	4,000
	<hr/>
	24,120

“Each cubic foot per second has been found adequate for the annual irrigation of 218 acres of land, but as one-third only of a district is usually irrigated, the remainder bearing dry crops not requiring irrigation, a cubic foot of water per second would be sufficient for the irrigation of 654 acres, or about one British square mile; a surface of 24,000 square miles may therefore be ultimately irrigated by these rivers.

“Of the entire volume of water hitherto running waste, one portion has already been applied to purposes of irrigation. The whole stream of the Jumna has been diverted from the main channel into two canals, called the Eastern and Western Jumna Canals.

	Miles.
The length of the Western Canal, with its branches, extends to . . .	425
That of the Eastern, to . . .	155
	<hr/>
Total, . . .	580

“The Ganges Canal is rapidly advancing to

completion. Its main object is the irrigation of the North-Western Provinces. A ridge of land rises slightly above the level of the adjacent country, and runs along the centre of the boat, sloping down on the one side to the Jumna, and on the other to the Ganges. The canal has been constructed on the top of this to the vicinity of Allyghur, whence it diverges in two channels, one to Cawnpore, and the other to Humeerpore, *via* Etawa, with three offsets termed the Futteghur, Bolundshuhur, and Coel branches.

"The total length of the canal, with its branches, will be 810 miles, viz. :—

Hurdwar to Allyghur,	180
Allyghur to Cawnpore,	170
Allyghur to Humeerpore,	180
Branch to Futteghur,	170
Branch to Bolundshuhur,	60
Branch to Coel,	50
	<hr/>
	810

"The total cost of the canal is estimated at £1,555,548, of which £722,556 has been already expended. It is believed that water will be admitted in the main lines in the course of next year."

Another important work in progress is the Baree Doab Canal, which, under the superintendence of Colonel Napier, is beginning to span the most important tracts of the Punjab. Unless present appearances are strangely deceptive, that newly acquired country will, in the course of a few years, exhibit the finest illustration of the benign influence of British rule to be found in the entire range of the territorial history of the East.

But it is not only through such works as these that the beneficence of the Company's rule has influenced the lives of the teeming millions of Hindostan. We have even greater works to boast of than these victories over arid soils and other material obstructions—works of moral regeneration, triumphs of reason and humanity, great successes accomplished by the benevolent energies of Christian gentlemen, in the face of all such difficulties and denials as are ever thrown in the way of social progress by ignorance and superstition, and the gross selfishness of men with vested interests in barbarism and falsehood. It was no easy work that we set ourselves when we attempted to root out the inhuman practices which have so long defiled the religion of the Hindoos, and to prevent a nation, grown grey in horrid superstition, from perpetrating the rankest crimes under the shelter of a cruel and irrational faith. There were many difficulties, but not the least of them was this,—that many large-minded men, whose humane and rational instincts urged them forward, unhesitatingly and uncompromisingly, to make war upon

these barbarous superstitions, were restrained and embarrassed by the feeling that the English ruler had constructively pledged himself to his native subjects to respect the religion and the customs of the country. Men there were, too,—not large-minded, not Christian in anything but name,—who thought, or affected to think, the Hindoos a very moral and religious people, and argued that it would be better to leave them and their customs alone. The opinions of the latter were of small account; but the "good faith" of the British Government was a great matter—it was to be upheld in all its purity and integrity; and many candid conscientious men were embarrassed and perplexed when they came to array on one side the consideration of their abstract duties as civilized and Christian men, and on the other the obligation of respecting the pledges under the shelter of which the people of India had submitted themselves to our rule. It was necessary under such circumstances to do nothing hastily and precipitately. It was necessary to enquire and examine—to ascertain what were really articles of religious faith, and what the mere after-grafts of a venal priesthood, or a pride-inflated aristocracy. Knowledge, therefore, preceded action. Oriental scholarship was made the handmaiden of civilisation. It was a great thing to learn what the old Hindoo lawgivers had really taught, what their religious books really inculcated. And in time it came to pass that English gentlemen better understood the scriptures of the people than their own most learned Brahmins, and could prove that much of the iniquity, supposed to be encouraged or sanctioned by their religion, had the support of nothing better than a modern interpolation, or a false reading of an ancient passage.

All this aided us greatly; and little by little we rose in Christian courage, and dared to do right. For years and years we had suffered in our own provinces, almost, indeed, under the shadow of the vice-regal palace of Calcutta, the Hindoo widow to ascend the funeral pile of her husband, and stimulated by selfish relatives and corrupt priests, to devote herself to a cruel death, sitting with the head of the rotting corpse in her lap, whilst the flames gathered around her. We were bound to respect the religious rites and the social usages of the people, and so we suffered these fearful murders to be committed at our very doors. The habitual murder of infant female children among certain tribes—a system which in some parts of the country had reduced the female population to a small percentage on the gross amount—had also gone

on from generation to generation, without hinderance or interruption. No effort had been made to arrest the desolating evil. It was little known—not at all understood. The Rajpoots believed that they had an undoubted right to poison their daughters as soon as they were born. But in process of time earnest-minded and bold-hearted men arose to suppress these great iniquities. The Home-government encouraged their efforts. Suttee, in our own provinces, was utterly abolished under the government of Lord William Bentinck. And what had been done authoritatively within our own dominions, we attempted to effect by expostulation and discouragement in the native states. Female infanticide, if not altogether extirpated, has been much diminished in all parts of India. In our own provinces it does not exist at all. Thuggee, another hideous evil—the systematic professional strangling of unsuspecting men—has, by a series of vigorous well-directed efforts, been almost entirely struck down and demolished. The great murder-gangs have been broken up. The whole system, with all its religious rites and ceremonial observances, has been thoroughly laid bare and anatomized; and it cannot stand up against the perfect knowledge which we have acquired of the dreadful subject. The human sacrifices, once so common in the Khond and other countries, have been suppressed; much has been done to discourage the barbarous customs and fearful orgies with which some of the Hindoo festivals are celebrated. And for many years now has the general tendency of British administration in India been towards the extinction of all the unholy rites and criminal practices which defile the religious and social systems of the people among whom we dwell. It may be very true that more might have been done, but it may fairly be doubted whether any other race of conquerors would have accomplished half as much.

External efforts, such as these, for the suppression of iniquities so long tacitly encouraged by the English in India, are worthy of all commendation. Doubtless they have done much to advance the moral and social improvement of the people; but more must be looked for from our internal efforts. The real influence must be from within. It is something to suppress such evils as we have glanced at; but it would be better still that, without any display of force or any manifestation of the law, they should quietly die out, under the destroying influence of a general diffusion of truth and a general spread of intelligence. The real remedy for all these evils is education.

That the English in India have, of late years, done much to diffuse among the people the light of European knowledge, is one of the truths on which the historian of the present Charter will delight to dwell; but it must at the same time be admitted, that only to a comparatively small portion of the inhabitants of India have these blessings yet been imparted. We have only as yet made a beginning; but it is a great one. National education even in England is still only in its infancy. When we consider the immense area over which our schools must be planted, and the teeming millions who are to be brought within their reach, we must not be disheartened because our progress is slow. Little by little, the light of knowledge will radiate from the large towns to the small villages. It is probable that some mistakes have been made in the system of education established in our Indian colleges; that too much stress has been laid on polite literature; that a little more practicality would have been desirable; but we cannot here afford to enter upon the criticism of details. It is enough for us that a vigorous impulse has been given to native education in all the three Presidencies of India; that the Court of Directors are earnest in the encouragement given to their servants to promote this great object; and that the results, to those who read them aright, are full of consolation and encouragement. "As soon as a little fellow," says an able contemporary writer, "could be made to understand that the earth was 25,000 miles round, there was an end to his belief in the Shastres."

But it is not enough that he should cease to believe in the Shastres; it is the desire of Christian men that he should believe in something better. Upon the *vexata questio* of the introduction of the Holy Scriptures into the Government schools and colleges, we do not now purpose to touch. It should be fully investigated, or not handled at all. But no controversy is suggested by the consideration of the present state of missionary labour in India. It is true, however, that Mr. Campbell, on most subjects a trustworthy authority, says,—

"The progress of Christianity in India, by the influence of private missionaries, cannot, in truth, be said to be great. I believe that they have some success in the south, where the Jesuits had preceded them, and where they found a large body of Christians; but even there the Protestants are few; and in all parts of the Bengal Presidency, it must be admitted, that the attempt to Christianize the natives has entirely failed. We have made some infidels, but very few sincere Christians, and are not

likely, on the present system, to make many more."

We have great respect for Mr. Campbell's statements and opinions—the statements and opinions of one who has seen much and thought much,—but the erroneusness of this is too patent to all who have studied the great subject of Indian Missions for us to suffer any question to be raised by this unhesitating announcement that the Bengal missionaries have "entirely failed." We know, indeed, that there are extensive mission-fields in Bengal, where Christian truth has been sown broad-cast. What the result of Protestant Missions in India has really been, may be gathered from some important statements recently published by the Rev. Mr. Mullens.* These statements are too detailed and too authoritative for us to doubt their authenticity. At the end of 1850, according to these statements, it would appear that there were in India and Ceylon, in connexion with our Protestant Missions, 403 missionaries (22 of whom are ordained natives); 551 unordained native preachers; 309 native churches; 103,000 native christians; and 17,309 communicants. There is enough, in short, in the statistics of Christian missions in India, and in the progress of education and enlightenment among the native population, even within the present generation, to rebuke the doubts and fears alike of those friendly and those hostile to the good cause. The missionary enterprise is as yet comparatively only in its infancy. But the triumph of Christianity in India may be nearer than either friends or foes, only a few years since, could have imagined; and the association of the educational with the missionary efforts, has greatly contributed to the progress of the gospel. It may seem, indeed, that even the little flock of professed native christians gives an exaggerated picture of the spread of real Christianity. It may be said that many of the professing native christians are christians only in name. We know it, and we deplore it, but there is room in the statements already given for very large allowances and depreciations; and yet still the balance of the good results will be sufficiently cheering to gladden the heart of every one who looks earnestly for the evangelization of our heathen fellow-subjects in the East. And what is there in the thought of evangelization abhorrent to reason and common sense?—what is there to make intelligent and enlightened men shrug their shoulders

and shake their heads? To us it appears, indeed, only wonderful that intelligent and enlightened men, tracing the progress of British power in the East from its humble beginning up to its present still incomplete grandeur, and seeing how, in spite of all hindrances and discouragements, in defiance of all human calculations, it has continued during two centuries and a half to expand and to gather strength, should doubt for a moment that, for some great ends of his own, God has committed all this vast country, and all these teeming millions to our care. And if this is to be believed at all, what difficulty is there in the farther belief, that the great end is the highest and holiest that the imagination can conceive, an end altogether worthy of the infinite goodness that shapes it? To us it seems, indeed, the greatest of all difficulties to believe anything else. The history of India is full of difficulties and perplexities—of wonderful mysteries and enigmas, to those who go groping about in the dark, and bewildering themselves with thoughts of human agencies, finite and self-contained. But reading it with the eye of Faith, all difficulties are smoothed away, all perplexities are unravelled, all mysteries are solved. The truth lies before us, clear and simple in its beauty and its grandeur, open to the comprehension of a child.

ART. IX.—1. *Scotch County Courts. Twelve Articles reprinted from the Edinburgh Evening Courant.* Edinburgh, 1852.

2. *Letter to the Commissioners of Supply of the County of Dumfries.* By MARK NAPIER, Esq., Sheriff of Dumfries-shire. Edinburgh, 1852.

3. *The proposed Abolition of the Office of Principal Sheriff in Scotland considered.* By GEORGE MONRO, Esq., Advocate. Edinburgh, 1852.

4. *Sheriff Courts of Scotland.* By a Member of the Faculty of Procurators, Glasgow. Edinburgh, 1852.

5. *Remarks on the proposed Changes.* By an Advocate, not a Sheriff. Edinburgh, 1852.

6. *Remarks on the Reform of Scotch County Courts.* By a Solicitor. Edinburgh, 1852.

7. *Legal Iambics in prose, suggested by the present Chancery Crisis.* By a Chancery Barrister. London, 1852.

8. *Letter to Lord Campbell on Reforms in the Common Law.* By Sir ERSKINE PERRY. London, 1851.

* Published originally as an article in the *Calcutta Review*, and subsequently, in a separate form with the name of the writer attached.

9. *Reform in the Bankruptcy Law of Scotland.* By "Scotus." Edinburgh, 1852.
10. *Remarks on the Operation of the County Courts Act.* By SAMUEL JOYCE, Esq., Barrister. London, 1850.

"WE will abolish the Court of Chancery, and transfer its jurisdiction and functions to the Courts of law at Westminster; and then we will go down to those Courts and open the shutters, and break some of the windows, and let in the light and air of common sense and reason, and sweep away all the cobwebs and rubbish of technicalities, and make quite new things of them; and then we will split them into as many lesser courts as there are, or should be counties, or, say, departments in the land; and we will have small Judges in these Courts to administer great justice at every man's door; and we will be non-litigants, and a prosperous and happy people."—The lawyers and the public are now members of the Happy Family, and the golden age has just begun.

The settlement of all the great political questions has left the public only legal and social reform. From the days of Elizabeth down to the passing of the Reform bill, two parties divided the empire;—the party of progress, and that of "the wisdom of our ancestors;" and the struggle has at length closed, by the last of a long series of triumphs,—that of Free Trade.

Exciting and interesting as is the history of contests, which have gradually worked out and settled the constitution of England, they were productive of one great evil. While engaged in discussing the doctrines of divine and hereditary right, the powers of the magistrate, and the duties of the people, the minor matters, upon which the home happiness of the population depended, were utterly forgotten. As if to make up for long neglect, each reformer is now more eager than his brother; and in nothing is the fury wilder, than on that very subject upon which, of all others, caution would be wisdom. A bare lifetime cannot master laws which the superficial study of an hour is now sufficient to overthrow. Great interests are at present dependent on the rashness of a fierce impulse, and the unregulated fury of an impatient passion. Undoubtedly, many are the reforms necessary to harmonize mediæval laws with modern civilization. Centuries cannot pass without a luxuriant crop of anomalous, unjust, and perverse rules. How they began and crept into the system none can tell. One judge repeats the error which another had begun, and others had continued. The ivy creeps over the ruin, though we take no account of the gradual

spreading of the livery of decay. Our judicial institutions like all other establishments decline,—we oppose the progress of the disease by palliatives till palliatives fail, and at last arrive at that stage when the alternative is offered, of a thorough renovation, or the utter destruction of the system, as happened fifty years ago, in revolutionary France.

The horror of law and lawyers was not without foundation in England. A more complicated and technical system of law than that of our English brethren was never known in the whole history of civilized nations. The laws of France, of Germany, and of Scotland, are derived in part from the system of neighbouring countries, and from the great fountain of Roman jurisprudence. To these were added a slight sprinkling of local customs, traceable to the remote ages when the northern conquerors brought them from their native wilds, on the extinction of the Western Empire. A book of French, of German, or of Scottish law, is intelligible to people who have not made it their study. A book of *English* reports is unintelligible even to the professional lawyer of another country. The probability is, that the decision turned not upon the merits of the dispute, but upon some technicality of pleading. This great misfortune to the English law and the English people, has produced more cruel agony, than all the wars that have cursed the land for a thousand years. A technical system is necessarily a costly one, and as that of England is unsurpassed in the one respect it is consistent as to the other. Both in its Chancery and Common Law Courts the amount of costs which may be run up in a simple suit is, to persons acquainted with the moderation of other systems, something appalling. The heavy oppression struck down here and there a miserable family, ruined by victory in a Chancery lawsuit. As the country increased in wealth the victims became more numerous, the outcry more of the character of a general clamour. What amount of discontent is necessary to move the tardy wheel of legislative improvement, what quantity of the law's injustice must be endured before relief is given, depends much upon the extent and character of the outcry. A man like Lord Eldon, swearing by his own virtues and the memory of his ancestors, stopped for half a century the onward tendency of the times, which in his eyes was only a sinful and fatal progression. In good time, he was gathered to his fathers. The slowly accumulating wrath of years was concentrated to a point; and legal reform was at length acknowledged as embracing all the largeness of national, and all

the individuality of private interest. Such unanimity of approval has never yet been gained for any object however intrinsically laudable, however sincerely promoted, or however enthusiastically desired. In other matters, where it is difficult to act with conviction and success, men grow disposed to float with the current of events, and to sail idly onwards. In the matter of legal reform such timid fatalism is now proclaimed to be a denial of the whole art of government, and the surrender of our reason to our fears.

The lamentable blunder made in England, was in the utter refusal of the English lawyers, to accept the aid of any wisdom *ab extra*. They were content to measure the duty of the present generation by the performances of the past. The Merton barons, who live in so many declamatory passages, as patriots who preserved intact the liberties of England, were in truth its worst oppressors. Their famous "*Nolumus leges Angliæ mutari*" fixed down upon the English people the barbarisms of an imperfect code. The division of Common Law and Equity, administered in different Courts, harmonizes neither with our ideal of a good system nor with our practical instincts. A more fruitful source of misery never afflicted the English people. It has entailed upon them the cost of double establishments,—which, to so great a nation, is perhaps the smallest evil. Along with this it has produced all the uncertainties consequent upon discordant jurisdictions. So narrow is the distinction between law and equity, that the most experienced in the Courts is often baffled. The labour of a lifetime is insufficient to insure certainty as to whether an action at law, or relief in equity, should be resorted to. The course is taken; years of litigation follow, long bills of costs run up, and at last the equity suitor is dismissed, because of the blunder of his lawyer in not taking a remedy at law, which he had from the beginning. And this same remedy at law was a matter pondered over at many an anxious consultation, and dismissed at last as a remedy too speculative to be tried. The expense, delay, and vexation,* consequent upon such a system, are not the least of the evils which it generates. It does injury to the law itself. It is dangerous to create a profound feeling of injustice. It is inexpedient at all times to refuse a man his claims, not from want of merit, but from over refinement and attachment to form. Under the infliction of such a trial, it is difficult for minds the most equable to acknowledge the wisdom of a technicality;

and it cannot be matter of surprise, if even the most philosophical of men, carry their indignation from the technical judge up to the perverted law.

The subject exhibits another illustration of the evil bias of self-interest on the human mind. Chancery barristers have written pamphlets in which they denounce the absurdities of special pleading;—special pleaders retort by an exposition of the infirmities of their neighbours. Each holds to his own as the perfection of jurisprudence, utterly forgetful of the fact that the bell is on the stroke by which an impatient public will announce the end of both. The pedantry,—the hostility to all enlarged and generous views—the disregard of every principle that does not address itself to the exigencies of the hour, the senseless passion for routine, and an unreasoning suspicion of theory, have been, until recent days, the unfortunate characteristics of the men to whom the destinies of the English law have been entrusted. The denunciations against them now are not the mere outcries of a senseless antipathy, but the settled convictions of intelligent men. Unhappily for the lawyers, they have clung to antiquated formulas with a blind fatality of error, which made their very sterility a part of their merit. Every proposed improvement was met with objections of that plausible character, which self-interest can always borrow from theory at a moment's warning. Words were evoked which are now meaningless, and appeals made to traditions which belong to the past, while all appreciation was lost of present times, characters, and conditions. The reforms recently adopted have been made with a trembling hand and a quivering voice. Special pleading still lives, and Chancery is as vigorous as ever. Merits are seen in the fragments which are wanting in the whole; and the wreck is clung to with chivalrous devotion, with all the greater love that it is the object of a universal detestation. The recent changes will in the end disappoint even their authors. They are based upon entire misapprehension of the necessity of the hour. They disappoint by a false moderation and irritating timidity, which can have, and deserves to have, no other result, but to excite only to disappoint; and postpone for a few months longer a more sweeping, more hasty, and therefore more dangerous change. It is painful thus to run round the dreary circle of expectation, disappointment, indignation, and abuse; each Parliamentary session blundering on in the acquisition of the untimely wisdom, taught by the consequences of folly.

Can there be in truth a clearer case for

* Not cured by 15 & 16 Vict. c. 86, § 62.

the application of the scalping knife than the system of special pleading in England. Instead of plaintiff and defendant being allowed to tell a plain story in plain words, they were compelled to state it in innumerable pleas, with ever so many counts—each plea with its replication, rejoinder, surrejoinder—with difficulties at every stage, until at last a stage was arrived at when the pleader must stop. Then he set to work and extracted the great object of all this laborious dialectics—a single issue:—“Hence duplicity, variance, departure, immateriality, and ghostly shapes of all kinds, dropping mischief from their paper wings, come hovering round in the gloom to inhale the reek of the sacrifice. Then what has been adjudged to be exact in one case, must be exact in another. Then what has been adjudged not to be exact in one case, cannot be exact in another. Then the precedent-book becomes the bed of Procrustes. Add to this the obsolete phraseology of olden times, not quite English, not quite French, not quite anything at all, stamped like the willow pattern on all this brittle crockery.”—*Legal Jambics*.

The establishment of the County Courts was the consequence of the failure of the ordinary tribunals. That they have been successful after such a failure, is saying little in their behalf. That they have been more successful than similar Courts in other countries, is to give them credit for what they do not deserve. Limited in their jurisdiction to a certain sum, they are also limited in regard to the character of actions. All equitable suits are still only to be heard in the Court of Chancery; and in this respect they present an unfavourable contrast to the Sheriff Courts of Scotland. Here there is no limit as to amount, no restriction as to the character of the suit; and the loud demand now made for the introduction here of the English County Courts, ignores entirely the fact, that we have them already, and a great deal more.

If the English County Courts have been productive of blessings to the general public, these have been obtained at the sacrifice of a great body of men. The people cannot run from Westminster Hall, as from the plague, without starvation to many. Every change in practical forms is productive of much private suffering. No ridiculous legal writ, whose very object it is difficult to state, can be abolished without taking the bread from the mouth of some one. The general public know little of the struggles of professional life consequent upon the diverting of business into new channels. Those who had obtained, if not fame, at

least respectability and competence, are in a moment reduced to the helpless condition in which they were when they began their studies,—left upon the shore high and dry, while the whole stream of business is rushing elsewhere. It is lamentable, at the present moment, to look at the condition of the English Bar. The vast army of barristers are represented by a still vaster army of solicitors, and they by a more numerous body of subordinates, all struck by the same heavy blow which has annihilated the common law Courts of England. Migrations are daily taking place from the Inns of Court in London to the County Courts in rural England, or to the Eldorado of the Australian diggings. The distress which all this indicates is almost beyond belief, and certainly constitutes one of the clearest cases for compensation,—if compensation could ever be admitted, when large classes of the community are ruined by imperial laws, rendered necessary for the general good.

In fact, the profession of an advocate has seen its day. No longer has he the same arena—no longer the same important questions to discuss. No longer will an Erskine be called upon to defend the liberty of speech, or to contend against the exploded maxims of the Stuart reigns. The constitution is settled, and those rights of governor or governed, in the discussion of which so many orators have acquired immortality, are matters of debate no more. The province of our advocates is limited to the narrow field of private rights, in which, no doubt, there is necessary as much force of intellect and comprehensiveness of judgment,—without, however, the stimulus to those exhibitions of genius, which so often awed tyrannical judges, and hurried subversive juries into justice.

As a means of attaining a livelihood, it is of all professions the worst. Even in the best times it was a lottery. In the present day we summon a competent witness to speak of its demerits. “I hear,” (said Lord Denman, in one of his recent letters to Lord Brougham,) “from all quarters that the most eminent men of the profession sit idle in Court, and that the juniors are losing all hopes of succeeding in the world as barristers.” In the struggle for the small share of business that remains, young men without influence and connexion, either in their county or with an attorney, are sure to be overborne. In every other trade or profession success attends industry and integrity. In the profession of an advocate, it is impossible, *a priori*, to foretell the fate of talents of the

highest order. The senior wrangler of his day has gazed with intense amazement, at being passed cleverly by a man who never entered the gates of a university. Powers of practical adaptation to the business of life, and a fertile and ready mind, are of more avail than all the elegant scholarship that ever came from Oxford. Those, too, who have had all the backing that kith and kin among attorneys could give them, and all the cases which their own or their family influence could secure from their own county, have gone no farther. While hope is at the prow, and youth at the helm, they sail gaily on, making much motion but little progress. The next stage is that of heavy juniors; and finally, they land safely among the old gossips, whose anecdotes keep up the connexion between the present generation and the one about to quit the scene. No study, no perseverance, no patronage can insure success; and hence the folly of throwing away so much undoubted talent as now wanders forlorn, seeking for fame and bread, and destined to a miserable life of inactivity and oblivion.

In the decline of professional business, there has fallen the high honour and morality of the Bar. It is difficult to be chivalrous under the pressure of narrow means, and the rules of etiquette stand a small chance against the vulgar necessities of the hour.

"With but few exceptions on each of the Circuits, and even at the Chancery, the men already who are thriving in their vocation, are not the well read and profoundly learned lawyers, but the sons, nephews, and cousins of attorneys; a tribe of underbred men, who derive shelter and success in the practice of *hugging* from the very rules which forbid it to a higher calibre of men and minds; a class with whom thrift follows fawning, as surely as shadows substance."—*Law Mag.*, vol. xlv. p. 272.

It is melancholy at all times to trace the decline and fall of an important class of the community, and more especially of a class with whose history is associated much of the history of England. The misfortune of the recent changes has been their sudden operation. Whole masses have been overwhelmed without time for preparation against the storm; and hence, in their very despair, they resort to means of safety which neither a nice sense of honour, nor any but a peculiar morality can justify. Perhaps, after a time, when the overstocked numbers of the profession are diminished to a suitable proportion with the business, the spirit of old days, relieved from the pressure of present times, may once again revive. We hope *that* time may come before the extinction of the race.

Leaving, however, the contemplation of the ruin to the legal profession consequent on the recent changes in England, let us look at the changes themselves, and the expediency of introducing them into Scotland. While we are willing to take from England those improvements which experience has declared useful, we must hold up a word of warning against the indiscriminate adoption of their system now urged upon us by our English neighbours. Conceiving the law of Scotland to be farther advanced without exception, than that of England, we humbly think that unity of law would be too dearly purchased by the sacrifice of our own. The exchangeable value of a great sentiment may be over-estimated. Unity of law may be purchased at a sacrifice too costly. The Scottish people will hesitate some time before adopting the proposition to import wholesale the Bankruptcy law, the Law of Succession, and the County Courts of England. A vigorous and well written pamphlet by Scotus, has exposed with the undeniable power of figures, the folly of supplanting the cheap bankrupt code of the one country by the cumbrously expensive one of our neighbours. We regret that our limited space, and another object, prevent us pursuing a discussion which Scotus has so ably conducted, and in which we cordially follow him until he comes to the *remedy* for existing evils. It is enough at present to look merely at the reforms contemplated in the instrument by which justice is dispensed, leaving the law itself for another and more dispassionate time.

There was one period in the history of Scotland in which a union of law and a common nationality were imminent. Had Edward triumphed at Bannockburn, and the little Scottish army been dissipated—its leader driven into exile, or trampled under the hoofs of the English cavalry, what a story of stirring events would have been blotted out from the history of mankind! what a difference in the Scotland of the present time! Out of the panic-stricken flight of the English army, Providence, which shapes the destinies of nations, has wrought a unity and a purpose, denied to the largest preparations and the most elaborate contrivances. Accidents like this have founded a dynasty which time has since swept away. The fable of Rome's growth, is the type of the development into which men are moulded, by a wisdom greater than man's. Over all the land, from Shetland to the Solway, would have waved the English flag. In every street would have been heard the accents of the English tongue. With reference to the people, one of two things would have hap-

pened,—either that they would have sunk into the degradation of a conquered race, like the Irish, or have been amalgamated with their Saxon conquerors, and so become an integral part of the English people. In all probability the latter would have been the result. The whole of Lowland Scotland was then filled with the same races as northern England,—community of language, of feelings, and, in part, of institutions existed; and hence, the elements for a complete fusion. The Celtic portion of the north within the Highland line, would in course of time have fallen, and perhaps not a century would have elapsed before the Scottish people would have looked upon the defeat of Bannockburn, with no greater reproach than the English now look back upon Hastings. The country could not have afforded to lose the important events crowded within the memorable 600 years, which have elapsed since the glorious day! Within that time a dynasty arose and has passed away. The Reformation and its leader gave us a purified religion, and a distinct nationality. The land in which, if Presbyterianism was not born, it was at least cradled and nurtured into manhood, would have been now peacefully under the shade of an apostolic episcopate. Our General Assemblies, Synods, and Presbyteries,—the republican equality of our religious institutions, would have been unknown; and one of the most striking chapters in the history of the general Reformation, would not have given its lesson to the world.

But it is in reference to the laws that we should have found the most striking change. This old country, which has for centuries of glory, grown and flourished under the benign influence of one of the most philosophic systems of jurisprudence, would have constituted the Northern Circuit of the united kingdom. What Baliol, even in his most broken-spirited hours, most cruelly lamented, must have been the general fate. The Courts of Westminster would have been the supreme judicatory, from which all judicial authority would emanate to the subordinate Judges of the North. If the prevention of all this were an evil, Bannockburn may be charged with it. Would amalgamation ever have left us in the high position which we have secured by our independence? The annals of mankind do not display a more profitable or glorious advancement. We defy all countries and times, all governments, all anarchies, to produce a similar aggregate of steady improvement, and so many triumphs accomplished over so many obstacles.

What could not be effected forcibly, is

now attempted in a more peaceful way. A number of English gentlemen have formed themselves into various societies, not merely for the codification of their own laws, but for the improvement of ours. The improvement consists principally in doing that which we have struggled for so many ages to prevent,—namely, the introduction into Scotland, by very much the worst system of law, and the worst mode of administering it, known in any country. Possessed already of a simple system, easily wrought and easily understood, it requires the exercise of great patience to listen to the proposal for its extinction, and for the introduction of that of England instead. A union of laws is no doubt an object to be hoped for, but it must proceed upon one basis alone, namely, the adoption by England, of the better system in existence here. There must be some conformity shown to the common sense of the age, in the adoption of a rational and enlightened code of laws in room of the intolerable inconveniences, the cumbrous costliness, and the feudal barbarisms of what Blackstone described as the perfection of human reason.

Beyond and above all others, the prominent department said to be thirsting for reform is the Scottish Sheriff Court. The English system of five years' antiquity, or nothing,—such is the offer. Ours is decayed from top to bottom. The mushroom of a night pushes aside the cedar of centuries. England has one judge with a large income, Scotland has two in each County with small incomes. The office of Principal Sheriff, therefore, is a grievance. Its virtues have been sounded, its powers exhausted. Aged, effete, and ridiculous, it is no longer in unison with the times. Half a century has been lost;—nonentities passing under the official name of "Sheriffs," exist in society for their own but not for the national good. It is time now to turn them out,—pluck the gowns from their backs, lay them on their Substitutes, and add their salaries to those of the latter. Thus the whole edifice is to be remodelled and reconstructed from the dead level of the new philosophy. And the new erection is to be wholly irrespective of the character, the object, the division, and the material of the former one.

It is not the first time that society has been assailed by attempts to prostitute great names to interests other than patriotic. If we live in an age of transition, we also live in an age of shams. Apart from the recent interference of some gentlemen in London, the movement in Scotland at the present hour, affords another interesting chapter in the history of popular cries. For

many long years the Sheriff-Substitutes besieged the doors of the Treasury for an increase of salary. They came with humble petitions, respectful remonstrances, appeals to reason, and to justice, clamorous descriptions of the expense and burden of a large family; but as they could bring little political influence to bear on their behalf, they generally returned as unsuccessful as they went. Each successive Lord Advocate was in vain appealed to. The County members, when they came down for the shooting season, had the long history of the matter explained to them; and some Substitute bolder than the rest, now and then ventured to utter a feeble moan over the desolate condition of his order, in the columns of the local newspaper. Years thus rolled on, each succeeding another with its weary disappointment, until at last the bright idea occurred to them, to obtain the long desired increase of their salaries by the spoliation of a friend.

Unhappily there has thus been mingled with the discussion of a grave question the irritation of rude personalities. The controversy began with a pamphlet from a Sheriff-Substitute (No. 1 of our list,) more in the tone of a conqueror returning from the field of victory, than of a cautious strategist commencing an uncertain struggle. The keynote thus given was taken up by other anonymous pamphleteers. Professing as their object the reform of a national institution, the Sheriff-Substitutes seem to have forgotten their mission. Sinking into oblivion the undoubted grievances of their Courts, they have expended their lamentations over their own ideal woes, and their energies on imaginary remedies. They have contrived to rouse a powerful opposition against important practical reforms, by a want of the wise discretion of seizing the mean between conflicting energies. Had they not printed it and published the lamentation, it is scarce credible to think that their chief grievance—greater than that of insufficient salary, is the name of *Substitute*! The mind seems to have become morbid in brooding over the sad truth, that

“A Substitute only shines brightly as a king,
Until a king be by; and then his state,
Empties itself, as doth an inland brook
Into the main of waters.”

The worst of all means was adopted to attain the coveted exaltation. Force and dignity might have been imparted to the demand, by chariness of argument and truthfulness of statement. Jealous of authority and impatient of control, the assailants, however, forgot, for the moment, the lan-

guage of decorum. The Sheriffs have been held up to obloquy and derision, and the result has been to create a sympathy for the abused. Taking advantage of the occasion, the Sheriffs have, in the person of several champions, stated their defence. In the multitude of pamphlets there is not wisdom. A wearisome array of facts and figures that lead to nothing and prove nothing—statements and counter-statements of exigencies and grievances—of injustice perpetrated by the one party with contumely, and borne by the other with patience—crowd upon the mind in painful and cumbrous confusion.

Not the least painful are the personalities. Mr. Napier, speaking with the dignity of a Sheriff, regards with scorn the insolence of a Substitute;

Have we not with special soul
Elected him our absence to supply;
Lent him our terror, dress'd him with our love;
And given his deputation all the organs
Of our own power?

Open abuse from the general public may be tolerated. It is the privilege of ignorance to be clamorous; and looking to the source from which it springs, the stroke loses all its point. The assailants renounce their opinions on better knowledge, and thereby withdraw their invectives. The fiercest outcries of open enemies against an institution are often little more than political conventionalities, which proceed on certain assumptions, and are forgotten when the assumptions are proved false. It is not so with the assaults of a friend, the rebellion of a subordinate, the ingratitude of a domestic. Their angry words are the seeds of enduring hostility. Their allusions are too familiar to miss their mark, too pointed not to strike well home, too envenomed not to rankle.

It is the supreme privilege of all men in this country,—in that respect superior to any other country in the world,—to express, without fear, their opinions upon every topic of public interest, and upon every public officer, however high. In claiming and exercising this privilege, every man vindicates a great principle. The law having provided for the observance of public decency and morality, leaves a wide arena for the conflict of opinions without fear of the issue. We tolerate many absurdities and some impieties, in the confident hope that, if we give them sufficient rope, they will be their own executioners. A man may deny the apostolic character of the Bishop of Exeter, and not be punished for blasphemy. He may even call in question the wisdom of a principal sheriff, or (better still) a supreme

judge, without fear of whipping. The *Courant Pamphleteer* may write with intemperance, and Mr. Munro may reply with gravity, and be alike protected. So long as in this controversy the disputants do not disturb the public peace, we allow them as much scope for their extravagances as they desire, trusting that they will tire of them at last.

Indeed, it is to this freedom of discussion that we attribute the beneficent action of all our institutions. The statement of a grievance is a warning to the wrong-doer of smouldering discontent or hidden danger. It gives him the opportunity of repentance, and enables him to check folly in its career. Had there been a free press in the Stuart times, the Stuart dynasty would yet have occupied the throne of England. Not one of their tyrannical deeds would ever have passed from conception into action, if on the morrow a thousand pens described in indignant words the natural emotions occasioned by crimes like theirs. Hence, looking to the blessings which this high power, rightly directed, confers upon us, it has been established as a fixed principle of our law, that it is not a libel to call in question the fitness or the competency of a public officer to discharge his duty. No doubt, the power is to be exercised with discretion, with forbearance, and with generosity. Men who may *reply*, are entitled to less consideration than those whose duties prevent them from mingling in the strife of parties, the contests of political discussion, or even from standing on the same platform with their fellow-citizens. But while judges can claim forbearance upon these grounds, that forbearance ought never, by the public, to be translated into an abnegation of the privilege. Mr. Napier, angry with the *Courant Pamphleteer*, drags from him the veil of anonymity, and compels him to stand forward by name, to defend his sneers and his conclusions. But when he proceeds farther, and suggests the removal from office of a man as fitted for it as the best Sheriff in the land, he commits an outrage upon that right of freedom of speech, which no one has, with more unbounded license, asserted, than the author of "*Montrose and his Times*." We can pardon everything in the pamphlet condemned, except its dullness. It was certainly a grave matter; but it was possible to be lively with such a tempting subject, as one's own virtues and the ignorant incapacity of superiors. Much vituperation, he no doubt gives us; but the lamentable facts are badly set in the usual flagrant work of sentiment and statistics. The example, however, is a good one,—not to be forgotten. What has made the English courts, in many

respects, better than our own, is the control exercised over them by public opinion and the press. In Scotland, on the other hand, there might for this purpose, be no newspapers at all; and hence judges are never awakened from their dream of perfection, except by a rare pamphlet which evokes a call for the author's professional extinction; or by that racy abuse which sometimes enlivened the reports of the House of Lords, when Brougham was there, but which, alas! we much fear, we shall hear no more.

The first circumstance to be noted in the discussion as to the expediency of having only one resident county judge, is the fact, that already two Parliamentary Commissions have reported on it. These were appointed at periods widely apart, and under different rule. In the good old days, when Eldon was Chancellor, there were commissioners reporting upon our judicial institutions equally as now. The office of county judge is apparently an office as eternal as the monarchy itself. All the views for the reform, or rather the extinction of the sheriff-courts, were stated in the year 1818,—evidence taken thereon,—and a report made to Parliament by Commissioners, of whom Sir Ilay Campbell, formerly Lord President of the Court of Session, was the chief. It was proposed then, not merely to compel the judge to be resident, and to have only one, but also to make a new division of the territorial districts called "*counties*," uniting some of the smaller, and equalizing the duties of the various local judges. It was further proposed "that the salaries paid to the Sheriff-depute and substitute should be united, and perhaps some farther addition made, so as to constitute a salary to the resident Sheriff, which might be sufficient to procure the services of persons well qualified for the office." All these proposals for organic change were, however, reported against. A recommendation was made and attended to, that the salaries of the Substitutes should be increased, and certain other regulations adopted, calculated to render both offices more efficient.

In 1835 another Royal Commission took evidence at great length upon the question once more; and once more unanimously reported against the change. They did so for many reasons, which will be found in the Report itself, and as quoted at length in Mr. Munro's able pamphlet. They stated justly, that the plan of local judges has presented itself in no country "in the same aspect in which it must be viewed in Scotland." In no other country has a local judge the unlimited jurisdiction possessed by a Scottish Sheriff. The conclusion was this: "We

are very decidedly of opinion, that such a change in the existing system of the local jurisdictions in Scotland is not only uncalled for and unlikely to afford any solid advantage which we do not at present possess, but that it would be attended with the most injurious consequences to the administration of justice in our local courts." This opinion was not given as the result of the experience of the Commissioners alone, nor upon speculative views of theirs, but upon evidence, and that evidence is thus described: "In Glasgow, the witnesses who were examined were much divided in opinion: the greater number even of those who were favourable to a change in this respect allowed that they chiefly contemplated the peculiar situation of a large and populous jurisdiction like that of Lanarkshire. But the witnesses from every other part of Scotland, who were examined, were nearly unanimous in holding, that any such change was not only unnecessary, but would be extremely inexpedient."

The circumstances have not changed since the date of this Report, except in two particulars. In the first place, there has been a change in the corps of Sheriffs since 1835. Many old men who did not attend the Court of Session—whose law, like the date of their appointment, was aged—have gone to their account, and younger men, compelled by recent legislation to attend the Supreme Courts, have supplied their place. In this respect, therefore, the public have been gainers. On the other hand, we have had the experience of County Courts in England, and the satisfaction expressed in regard to them, by the verdict of the English people. But we again protest against citing direct contrasts as analogies. The abominations of the ordinary English Courts were such as to render any system popular, which had the opposite virtues of cheapness and finality. Our readers will see in the sequel a description of the doings of a Sheriff—when unchecked by the right of appeal—in his Small Debt Court. It has often been deplored as a great evil that such things must be tolerated. Arising, as they do, from the imperfection of human nature, it is not surprising to find them over all England to a much greater extent, in consequence of the greater amount which, without review, an English County Judge can give judgment for. We ask attention to the following illustrations of the working of that greatest of evils in the administration of justice—the power of judging without appeal:—

"Hundreds of decisions have been given totally different in similar cases, and many diametrically opposite. At the present moment the law is as diverse in its operations as the divisions

in which it acts. One judge decided in favour of allowing a suitor to split his demands, while others have denied his ability to do so. In one district, the execution creditor has preference over the landlord; in another, the landlord over the creditor. Some judges will only allow certificated attorneys to plead before them; others will permit their clerks; and a few will allow agents or accountants. Locality alone decides the great questions of the law, and a suitor's chances of obtaining a verdict are in proportion to the district in which he lives."—*The Lawyer*, vol. i. p. 25.

The case is more pithily stated by Mr. Joyce:—

"In one metropolitan County Court the law is treated with contempt: they read unstamped documents. In another Court, the Judge, less bold, but more astute, bows to the law, but renders it ineffectual, by condemning a party *objecting* to the costs occasioned by the delay."—(P. 13.)

The last account that we have seen of the English County Court is by Mr. Monro:—

"Let us now look a little farther at the English system, which—apparently on the principle of *omne ignotum pro magnifico*—is held up not merely as a vast boon to England,—which it is; but as a model to be implicitly followed by Scotland,—which it is not. A Parliamentary Return as to these Courts for the year 1851, just issued, while it affords no data as to the element of *delay*, contains sufficient facts to upset the whole assumptions of their superior cheapness. The system is plainly dearer, *without* an appeal, than ours is *with* an appeal. The total causes tried during the year 1851 were 233,646, including, of course, those wherein no opposition was made, and where, we presume, in accordance with English practice, a *prima facie* proof was sufficient and necessary. The total sums (exceeding costs) for which judgments were given was £815,514; the total amount of costs allowed was £191,075, being nearly one-fourth of the amount of the debts,—thus, the costs on both sides would be about one-half of the debts; and as in England they are much more familiar than we with *extra* or *disallowed* costs, the real amount would be considerably greater.* If the undefended causes had been separately stated, the proportion of costs in defended causes would have been considerably greater. But taking the matter as it stands, the result is decidedly favourable for the Scotch system, as there can be no doubt that the cost allowed in *defended* suits under £50 in the Sheriff-Courts, does not, on the average, amount to so much as one-fourth of the debts. We trust, therefore, we shall hear no more of the superior cheapness of the English County Courts; and by certain simple reforms the expense of the Scotch Courts will be much farther reduced."

* See Article IX. of Mr. Monro's pamphlet, where it is shewn that this is much too favourable a view of the English costs.

The author of the "Scotch County Courts" commences his attack upon the Sheriffs-Principal by the remark, that "it is needless here to enter into an historical explanation of the origin of the two classes of Sheriffs, and of the relative importance of their several duties at successive periods. It is with the present and not with the past that we have now to do."—P. 51. It may happen, however, that the past reflects a light upon the present, and may help to guide the path of modern improvement. Without a reference to its history, neither the value nor the defects of the institution can be discovered; and therefore we cannot so summarily dismiss the history and services of the most ancient of all our judicial institutions.

The office is of great antiquity. Its institution is lost in the mists of times anterior to written history. The name occurs coeval with our first authentic records, and in all our annals occupies a conspicuous place. The affectation of copying everything from England, was never more out of place, than in sinking this historical name, to adopt the new English cognomen of County Judges. The endurance of the office was regulated entirely by the Sovereign's grant; and in the course of time, in becoming hereditary, became the source of many evils to Scotland, which were consummated in the Rebellion of '45.

The Sheriff had a deputy nominated by himself. With the exception of a few crimes, reserved under the feudal government to the principal court of the Sovereign, the Sheriff could try all, even though inferring capital punishment. His emoluments were derived from the fines and penalties, common enough in the forfeitures of tumultuous times.

Thus the office of Sheriff continued a high and honourable one, conferring upon the family who held it an influence which enabled them in many rebellions, to rouse the population even against the sovereign himself. Many a struggle was made against this crying evil by the Scottish Parliaments and the Scottish Kings; but it was only after the Rebellion of '45, that relief was obtained, by the utter annihilation of the heritable jurisdictions.

It was by a statute which followed shortly after the defeat of Culloden, devised chiefly by Lord Hardwicke and Duncan Forbes, that the present system of Sheriffships was called into being. The old office of High Sheriff was allowed to exist, though no longer hereditary. It is now conferred upon the person holding the office of Lord Lieutenant of the county. All the plenary powers of jurisdiction of the olden times are

now, however, conferred upon a new officer, nominated no longer by him, but by the Crown.

To the sagacious minds of Hardwicke and Forbes, it appeared, while they abolished their abuses, to be unadvisable utterly to abolish the ancient local jurisdictions of the Sheriffs, and the simple remedy they resorted to, was, to put the appointment to the office into the hands of Government. Formerly the Sheriff-depute might be any one whom the High Sheriff pleased, and he generally was the local representative of the Sheriff himself. A worse judge,—because necessarily influenced by local partialities, and by the strong motives of personal interest, could not have been named. Hence it was that a stranger to the county, and a lawyer, was fixed upon. He is required to be an advocate of three years' standing,—his appointment is for life,—and in effect he holds the same situation which the Sheriff occupied under the Scottish monarchy. He is no longer termed Sheriff "depute;" and in all respects is an independent officer, holding his appointment from the Crown in the same manner as the supreme judges themselves.

The original idea was the consequence of the evils resulting from the old system. As great oppressions, flagrant wrongs, dangerous rebellions, cruelties of every kind perpetrated in the name of law, had been fostered and created by the local attachments and partialities of the Sheriff, and by the influence which he acquired, the legislature determined to avoid this evil by appointing a person resident for the greater part of his time in Edinburgh. Hence the salary which was allotted to him, was adjusted upon the principle, that it was not to be regarded as his sole means of livelihood. Attendance upon the Law Courts was required as a qualification for holding the office. It kept up an acquaintance with the current law, and it removed him from the sinister influences by which his judgments might be biased. Allowed to practice as an advocate, his whole time was not given to the duties of his office, and therefore he could not, in fairness, claim a salary upon that principle. The amount was fixed, upon the idea of considering the county as his best client; and the salary, as the fee for labour done on behalf of the county.

For many years subsequent to the reform in the office of Sheriff, this Edinburgh lawyer was the responsible and the efficient officer. He was allowed to appoint a substitute to manage the business that required local attention. The substitutes at first received no salary whatever, except what the

Edinburgh lawyer gave them, and certain fees which, in course of time, they either legally or illegally exacted. The persons selected, as might have been expected, were in no respect similar to the honourable men who are now their successors. Formerly, they were of any and of all trades prior to their appointments. Half-pay officers, bank agents, land surveyors, gentlemen without professions, and small writers in small country towns, wielded the high powers of the mighty Sheriffs of the old days. Of course, receiving little or nothing in name of salary, they carried on, as they were justly entitled to, their former trades. The parsimony of government thus gradually brought things back to the old iniquity, of the judge determining causes, in matters in which he himself was interested.

In course of time the position of the Sheriffs has very materially altered. The office of substitute instead of being, either in reality or name, subordinate and unimportant, has become the most important in the county. He is the territorial judge during the absence of his principal, and he cannot be this without occupying a position attended with great responsibility, great labour, and great expense.

The criminal jurisdiction of the Sheriff extends generally to all but capital crimes. His power of punishment is, however, limited. He cannot pronounce death, nor sentence to transportation. This seems to be regarded a grievance; and one of the reforms loudly insisted on, is the extension of power to these local Judges in the matter of punishment. It is said, that in England, the Quarter Sessions have the power of transportation, and the argument is, that if unprofessional justices can doom a man to Norfolk Island, why should not a Scottish Sheriff? Is the writer aware of the fact, that of all the branches of the Criminal Law of England, this has created the loudest and most continued outcry? He has read the newspapers to little purpose, if he has not seen authenticated tales of innocent men condemned through the ignorant rashness of a Quarter Sessions. But, assuredly, we would trust such a tribunal with a confidence we could not place in the Scottish Sheriff-substitute. The unprofessional training of a Justice of Peace may render him unskilful in dissecting evidence, or in the application of the law. It is not his duty, however, but that of the Jury, to decide upon the evidence. His province commences when the prisoner is found guilty. Up to that stage, any mistake he may have committed can only have been in a faulty charge to the Jury, or in the admission or rejection of evidence.

When he comes to award punishment, is he not as good, nay, perhaps a better Judge than a trained lawyer? He is as capable of estimating the considerations upon which punishment should be imposed, depending as they do, upon views of social policy and public police, which all men of education are capable of understanding. Above all, there is one guarantee against the imposition of cruel and disproportionate punishments, in the fact, that they are not pronounced by one man, but in accordance with the judgment of a number of men. Thus, the folly, the rashness, the want of thought, the indifference to consequences of one, are, or at least may be, checked by the interference of his brethren.

The enormous jurisdiction of the Sheriffs has been prevented from running into abuse, by countervailing checks. Their judgments are all subject to *appeal*,—a provision which, while it effects the object, does it rather by prevention than by cure. The fact of contentment, not certainly with the cumbrous forms of written pleadings, but with the existing institutions, proves that we have in them some cause of rejoicing, and that the course of our affairs under them has not been uniformly wretched. We have had cause to be thankful, at least for immunity from the offensive anomalies and the legal oppressions of the system of our neighbours. Our pamphleteers, hurried away by the distemper of remedy, are compelled to be both laudatory and abusive. They sing the triumphs of beneficent institutions, and in the same voice proclaim them unworthy of farther existence. The honoured name under which they have acquired all their glory and renown, is even sneered at; and the proposed reform ascends to the dignity of a revolution, by involving a total change in the character and genius of the system.

It is loudly urged that the existence of the principal Sheriff constitutes a bar in the way of justice. It is unnecessary to go farther if this statement be well founded. The Sheriff's duties consist, in part, in reviewing the decisions of his Substitute. Resident in Edinburgh, it is said that expense is incurred in obtaining this review. The appeals, it is farther said, are so numerous as to impede the progress of the cause. The expense of an appeal is only one shilling, or at most half-a-crown, of sterling money. If a man feel himself aggrieved by the judgment of the local Sheriff, he is entitled to get a review of that erroneous interlocutor, upon paying the carriage of a parcel to Edinburgh. The review might, no doubt, be made cheaper, but a reduction even to ninepence or sixpence is not worth

all this outcry. It may, however, be the fact that all review is inexpedient. *That* ground is worthy of examination; but, in the meantime, it would be desirable, if the office of Sheriff is to be abolished on account of the expense it creates to suitors, that the parties using that argument would explain it.

The fact of there being no such appeal in England as in this country, is, in truth, the misfortune of the one and the characteristic glory of the other system. But even were it otherwise, and were it the fact that in England a single judge is a blessing, it does not follow (because the cases are not identical) that it would be a blessing here. An English county Judge rules over a populous district, where there is a public opinion to control him, where the press attends sedulously to his doings, and where, in general, he is acting in the face of a bar of educated barristers or attorneys. It is far otherwise in Scotland, where, except in the large towns, the Sheriff is controlled neither by press nor bar, and where (population being scanty) public opinion, especially against a Judge, is feeble.* A single Judge, resident in a country district, however honest in intention, is subject to painful difficulties in the discharge of duty. He is subject to those infirmities which are not peculiar to him or to his profession, but belong to human nature. He is under the domination of interest, which so often tramples upon duty, and of his passions, which trample upon both. He has his likings and his hatreds, his partialities for his friend, his dislike to an enemy, his indifference to strangers. In casting the balance of an ambiguous proof, where the scales are equal, or nearly so, is it to be wondered that they will incline in favour of the noble and honourable baronet, and the high and puissant noble, whose hospitality the local Sheriff so often enjoys—whose pleasant attentions are so much appreciated at home, and whose kindly memorials in the shooting season are so heartily welcome? A Sheriff is but a man. He who sits with that austere gravity, is, in his convivial moments, as cheerful and as hilarious as the weakest of us. Subject to like passions as ourselves, we would wish not to throw the tempta-

tions of opportunity in his way, but rather to support his feeble resolutions and his wavering convictions, by all the external aids which we can derive from the lessons of experience.

Is this a fancy sketch? Let any one acquainted with the working of judicial tribunals run his mind over the history of his own experience. One of our pamphleteers appeals to the working of the system in the Small Debt Courts of Scotland, in which the Sheriff-substitute may decide cases to the limited amount of £8, 6s. 8d., without appeal. The pamphleteer is too much enamoured of his own and his brethren's doings. Elevated above the level of the litigants and the bar, he hears not their murmurs and their indignation. In questions of this nature the highest point of view is not the most satisfactory. If we descend a little lower we see our bearings more clearly, and breathe an atmosphere more suited to ordinary lungs. At the lofty height which it is the fortune of a Judge to occupy, it is too natural that he should now and then omit to notice the uneasy repinings of the victims of his ignorance. It would be a rudeness alike uncourteous and impolitic for an influential Solicitor, whose bread is dependent on the good-will of the Judge, to lay bare his failings to his own astonished eyes. The press in this country, the only other medium of public complaint, seldom interferes with this subject, which it does not understand. Thus the local Judges throughout Scotland are more or less labouring under the delusion, of imagining that because there is no loud complaint, there is satisfaction. The Glasgow practitioner seems better informed:—

"I venture to say that no person who is in the habit of attending the present Small Debt Courts, or who is acquainted with their practical working, can be satisfied with the manner in which the business is there conducted."—P. 33.

The author supports this statement by a description of the mode in which the cases are usually gone through, and the conclusion he arrives at is, that, practically speaking,—

"The judge never really hears the case he is trying, but decides upon a one-sided or partial statement. Hardly a Court day passes in which some of the suitors do not find themselves in one or other of these predicaments, and suffer injustice and the loss of their cause because of their inability to state it properly. These parties' complaints are not heard by the public, because the sufferers are unable to make them known. But their injuries are not less real on this account, nor their feeling of injustice less acute."

* "Besides the satisfaction afforded to parties by professional aid, the presence of counsel or agents has also a beneficial influence on the Judge. It tends to make him more careful and precise in the enunciation of legal principles. He will feel that it is a different thing laying down the law before men who may be as skilled in it as himself, from propounding it, *ex cathedra*, in presence of an audience who have no idea whether he is right or wrong."—*Scotch County Courts*, p. 25.

We shall select the Edinburgh Court as being the best equipped, and the most thoroughly under the control of public opinion. Another "Solicitor" gives a sketch from the life of the procedure there. The judge, it appears,

"decides from 15 to 25 cases per hour, in one half of which parties have to be heard, witnesses examined, and an irreversible judgment pronounced. Under this system, even a correct decision gives little satisfaction. The loser thinks he has been unfairly dealt with, and the successful party cannot but feel that he owes his success more to accident than to the justice of his cause. The dignity of the bench is also compromised by the indecent haste which is sometimes exhibited. Oaths are administered and taken with a levity, and even recklessness, painful to witness; and above all, this system encourages trick and perjury, which can more easily escape detection than if each case were thoroughly sifted."

If such be the practice in the metropolitan Small Debt Court in Scotland, what is it in remote districts, without a bar or a public opinion to keep the judge in check? If levity, indecent haste, recklessness, be the characteristics of the institution, we must pause before extending them without a guarantee. We must have a safeguard against the prevailing evil of all these Courts,—the evils resulting from the caprice, the hot-headedness, and the obstinacy of the judge. More scandalous acts of injustice are daily perpetrated in these petty Courts, from the single circumstance, that the judge knows his decree to be irreversible, than are done in the ordinary Courts in a year. A confused statement—a peevish remark—a drawling inconsecutive argument, wears the patience, as it stimulates the irritation of the exhausted Sheriff. He wrangles, disputes, and argues; and at last hushes the uproar, by an unjust decision against the pertinacious litigant. It is because the pecuniary amount is not ruinous, even to a poor man, that the present system is endured. The Small Debt jurisdiction of £8, 6s. 8d., stands, moreover, in this peculiar position,—of not being open to the same objections that would be applicable to an extended sum. In general, the parties who are in the Small Debt Court are alike unknown to the Judge. They move not in his circle—they do not meet him at dinner—his and their wives are not bosom friends. In consequence of this, justice has a better chance. But the moment we come to litigations of higher moment, we ascend to a more elevated platform, on which may stand the Sheriff's patron, or his boon associate. It is idle to indulge in declamations on the honesty and good intentions of men.

However noble may be their resolutions, they are human, and the grandest Cato of them all, will veer about according to the impulses of passion or caprice. There is just one system, and one only, which could reconcile the people of this country to single Judges without appeal. This is the system in use with excisemen and Methodist parsons. Let Sheriffs remain in a single place only for five years, by which time their attachments will begin to take root, and their habits to grow into a principle. To prevent the evils of the one and the other, let them be at once drafted away to other towns,—the farther off, the better for justice and the law. In the Prussian dominions, this course is adopted with reference to almost every government officer; and the benefit of it is exhibited in the management of our own excise,—the exciseman never being allowed time sufficient to court and marry the distiller's daughter, or be softened from officiality to humanity, by long continued remembrances from the distiller's farm.

These considerations do not seem to have occupied the mind of the County Court Pamphleteer. The only panacea for all the evils which afflict us, is the transmutation of the name "Substitute" (which always falls on the ear like a vulgar imprecation) into Principal,—no appeal, and double salary. In the pursuit of the object of the moment, he overlooks facts, and pushes his conclusions to results which his facts contradict. With him the Sheriff Small Debt Court is an Arcadian paradise, which the lieges are eager to enter and loath to leave. Wherever similar procedure can be obtained in other courts, parties are only too happy and anxious to get into the fray. There is an Act of Parliament, called the General Railway Act, applicable to the whole kingdom, which authorizes public companies to take possession of lands on making compensation. "The sum here involved," says the pamphleteer, "is often hundreds or thousands of pounds, yet the parties interested knew too well the value of a speedy and final judgment to permit any appeal, however important might be the sum at stake." The parties interested never were consulted as to the terms of the Railway Act. They take the Act as it was framed for them by the Lord Advocate of the day, and whose particular notion it was to have the cases decided as provided for by that statute. Perhaps the authority is still better than the "parties interested," and serves equally well the purpose of our honourable friend.

In his anxiety, however, to adduce an ex-

ample of conclusive importance, he omits to shew the distinction which exists. He wishes a single judge and an irreversible judgment, while, in the case to which he makes reference, the judge has no more to do with the decision than his own door-keeper. The matter is left entirely to a jury, who may, no doubt, be ignorant enough; but who, excavated from the cellars and shops of the Grassmarket, or dragged from their farms away in the country, are free from the formidable objection which we are now considering.

It is impossible, in treating such a theme as this, to do so in other terms than generalities, and as such, of course, the argument itself loses a great part of its force. In this respect the learned pamphleteer has the advantage of being able to dilate upon the virtues of his brethren, a theme upon which he exhausts all his eloquence. It would be odious to answer him, by dragging before the public particular instances to the contrary; and a reference to past history, even though not remote, would be dismissed with the reply, that we now live in a better and a purer age. In this dilemma, we are obliged to place our assertion against his. We assert it as an undeniable fact, that unrestrained power in the hands of any one man, in every case, is more or less abused,—partly from the commission of positive injustice, arising from dislikes or partialities, irritation, bad temper,—and partly from the vice of laziness, which grows upon a man whose sides are not stimulated by the spur of superior authority.

What is now insisted for is, indeed, without example, as it is without sense. There is an appointed check for every power under the sun; the sword of Damocles for Louis Napoleon; revolution for the constitutional sovereign, mutiny for the chief, reform for the House of Commons, the press and the bar for an English county judge. At the time of the Union between the two kingdoms, Defoe tells us that great difficulty was felt by the statesmen of that age, in regard to the constitution of the Court of Appeal. He mentions that it was proposed that the British House of Peers should nominate a Committee of delegates to meet in Scotland, which might be composed of Scottish lawyers. The proposal was negatived, and a resolution taken to try the experiment in the House of Lords itself, where, although there were only English lawyers, yet they were strangers to the parties. Appeals, accordingly, were carried to the British House of Lords, and the old Judges of the Court of Session frequently complained, of the intolerable evil of these

appeals, which reversed judgments inconsistent with justice. The old Court of Session was composed of men of learning,—of position in society, and subject to all the wholesome influences consequent upon residence in the metropolis. Yet a court more corrupt, in respect of decisions given according to the feelings of the Judge, and not the justice of the case, never existed. To Scotland there has not been a greater blessing than the right of appeal to the House of Lords. It would be still more so if it were less expensive. In the course of 150 years it has made the Court of Session, a tribunal possessed of a large share of the confidence of the public. All acquainted with the working of judicial tribunals would, however, bemoan it as a national calamity, if that right of appeal were extinguished. A useful institution would be turned into a curse, by the removal of an ever-present stimulant to duty. The fact, that what a man says here in Edinburgh, as the ground of judgment, will be hacked and torn to pieces at the bar of a foreign tribunal,—if foolish, laughed at,—if unjust, denounced,—and the whole of this criticism recorded and published in reports of authority for the perpetual instruction and delight of mankind,—are facts which, during every day of a judge's existence, keep him to propriety and his duty.

At present the public have two servants for the same money, for which it is proposed they should have one. Would better law be administered by the same man, if he stood alone? Would any interest be served by the change, except his own? So far as our experience has gone, the existence of the office of Sheriff-Principal in Scotland, has, amid all the discussions on this subject, been to the people of this country productive of a blessing which has not hitherto been noticed. Our readers are aware that the Court of Session is the supreme tribunal in this country, to which there is a right of appeal from all inferior courts. The average number of cases appealable, decided throughout the kingdom of Scotland, yearly, may be ascertained from Parliamentary returns. From the Report of the Law Commission, in 1834, (p. 68,) it appears, that during the five years from 1828 to 1832, inclusive, the total number of actions brought into the ordinary Sheriff courts was 65,662, making an average of 13,132 for each year. By a more recent Parliamentary return, the number for 1836 was ascertained to be 14,135. The number has gone on increasing every year since, at a rapid rate. Thus, in 1834, the number in Lanarkshire was 5622; but Sir Archibald Alison states, that in 1852

it had increased to 7500, and in many other counties the increase has been equally remarkable. If we take 20,000 as the yearly average now, it will be within the mark. Of all this vast number, there were brought into the Court of Session by appeal, not more than 160* in the year 1851; and this, let it be remembered, is the result, although there is an appeal both on the law and the facts. That greater confidence is now felt in the practical administration of justice by the Sheriffs, is evidenced by this remarkable fact, that while the number of cases has increased in their Courts, the number of *appeals* from the Sheriffs' judgments to the Court of Session has diminished. Thus, even in 1824, the average number of cases appealed to the Court of Session was 188.† The House of Commons, on 27th February 1838, ordered to be printed an abstract of certain returns from the Sheriff-Courts, from which it appears, that for the three years 1834, 1835, and 1836, the total number of cases carried to the Court of Session was 332, making an average of 110 yearly, which (making allowance for the increase in Sheriff-Court business) is more than the yearly average now.

Now, to what is this attributable? Is it not to the fact, that the defeated litigant has obtained the opinion of *two* judges upon his case, and which, if not satisfactory, affords, at least, a most powerful reason for acquiescence? If two men arrive at the same result, unconnected with each other, and each anxious to decide rightly, the presumption at least is, that justice is administered. Hence, the almost universal acquiescence in the judgments of the Sheriff-Courts; more than three-fourths of which we believe to be now decided by the Sheriff-Principal on appeal.

It is further proposed not merely to abolish the appeal to the Sheriff-Principal, by abolishing that office, but to give a power of final judgment to the extent of £30 to the Sheriff-substitute, then become the sole judge. Is this power justified by any enormous evil consequent upon the present right of appeal in cases under £30?

* It is difficult to get at the precise numbers. In the year 1850-1851, we find from the rolls that only one hundred and forty-eight cases were brought to the Court by *advocation*; of which, moreover, fourteen were on the undefended list. It may be that several inferior court-judgments were brought up by *suspension*. The rolls do not, however, shew what were suspensions of decrees, and what of other kinds. We are within the mark when we say that the *suspensions* of decrees are not one-twentieth of the *advocations*. We made a large allowance, therefore, in the text.

† Appendix to Report of Royal Commissioners, on Forms of Process in Scotland, 18th March 1824, p. 253.

In the language of the old Roman Emperor, it is the duty of a statesman to take care that suits be not immortal. To attain such a blessing, the country would acquiesce in a single judge and an irreversible decree. The course intrinsically the worst is often the most expedient, and human policy must condescend to human infirmity and even to human error.

But the whole of this argument is based on the wildest delusion as to the facts. Even the *Courant* Pamphleteer is found making the very important admission, that hardly any of the cases under £30 which occupy the attention of the inferior Courts ever go to the Court of Session; but while making this admission, it is strange to find the author fail in deducing from it the conclusion which lies upon the surface. In the year 1851, out of the 160 cases appealed, we cannot trace more than seventeen cases for sums under £30. Thus the whole evil to be remedied is to bar the way into the Court of Session of not twenty appeals; and for this benefit our modern pamphleteers are quite content to ruin the judge, by leaving him without a check. In truth, the whole of this outcry about the benefit to result from giving present Sheriff-substitutes a power of final judgment, is calculated to serve no good purpose to any human being. These seventeen appeals, miserable enough in themselves, and in which generally one of the parties is upon the poors-roll, are of no importance to the practitioners in the Appellate Court. They are in one sense a nuisance, and at all times disagreeable to plead; but then, this is the noble purpose which they serve. They keep the subordinate judges ever in mind, that for every hasty decree they are amenable to a higher tribunal, and that to the poor man's case equally as to the rich, they must give patience and attention.

It is painful to think that, at present, cases, because they are small in amount and generally those of poor people, are got rid of by the dozen, in the manner described by the Edinburgh and the Glasgow Solicitors. The author of the "*Scotch County Courts*" promises amendment in this particular, if we trust him with an extended jurisdiction and a larger salary. "The great mass of cases that are now tried in the Small Debt Court are easily and speedily disposed of; but if cases involving a larger amount were to be competent there, they would of course require to be more [why more?] cautiously and deliberately gone about."—P. 23. With reference to these, he assures us that plenty of time and a patient hearing would be given to the parties. We are in vain moved by promises of future amendment

belied by past practice. While the experiment was new and the public attention awakened, there might be an improvement. The old evils would however soon return, and the old scenes, for which this apology is offered, would be enacted before the eyes of indignant suitors.

We are not surprised at the annoyance of an inferior judge at the scourge of an appeal. It is at all times irritating, to have the result of his own reflections and labour thrown away, in consequence of the different opinion of his superior. If the interests to be regarded were the feelings of the inferior judge, the consideration might be important. But the only interests to be attended to, being those of the public, the discussion must be limited to the effect of the system upon these. We have already stated that the expense to the

litigant is just one shilling or half a crown. The time occupied in the disposal of the appeal may not be above a single day,—of course if the Sheriff-Principal is indolent the delay is greater,—but the learned pamphleteer may lay this unction to his soul, that he has stirred up a lively attention even in the worst of them, and made them nearly equal in ability and painstaking to a Sheriff-substitute.

On the subject of salaries some liberties have been taken with the facts. The following are the whole sums paid to the local judges throughout Scotland, it being premised that the Substitutes are paid somewhat after the manner of a servant on good behaviour. They all begin with £50 less than what is noted here; the increase being £5 every year till the full salary be attained:

Counties.	Sheriffs.	Salaries of Sheriffs.	Districts of Counties.	Substitutes.	Salaries of Substitutes.
Aberdeen, . . .	A. Davidson, . .	£400	Aberdeen, . . .	W. Watson, . . .	£500
Argyll,	E. F. Maitland, .	400	Peterhead, . . .	J. Skelton, . . .	350
			Inverary,	J. MacLaurin, . .	450
Ayr,	A. Bell,	400	Campbelltown, .	J. Gardiner, . . .	350
Banff,	A. Currie,	300	Tobermory, . . .	W. Robertson, . .	350
Berwick,	R. Bell,	300	Ayr,	J. Robison,	500
Bute,	R. Hunter,	300	Kilmarnock, . .	T. Anderson, . . .	450
Caithness, . . .	R. Thomson, . . .	300	Banff,	J. Pringle,	400
Clackmannan, }	John Tait,	300	Dunse,	A. Wood,	400
Kinross,			Rothsay,	A. C. Dick,	400
Dumbarton, . .	J. C. Colquhoun, .	300	Wick,	H. Russell,	450
Dumfries,	M. Napier,	350	Alloa,	W. B. Clark, . . .	350
Edinburgh, . .	J. T. Gordon, . . .	1000	Kinross,	D. Syme,	350
			Dumbarton, . .	W. C. Steele, . . .	400
Elgin and }			Dumfries,	J. P. Trotter, . . .	450
Nairn, }	B. R. Bell,	300	Edinburgh, . . .	A. Jameson,	600
Fife,	A. E. Monteath, .	400	Do,	P. Arkley,	600
Forfar,	J. L'Amey,	350	Elgin,	P. Cameron,	400
Haddington, . .	W. Home,	300	Nairn,	A. Falconar,	350
Inverness, . . .	W. F. Tytler, . . .	400	Cupar,	G. Grant,	500
			Dunfermline, . .	C. Shireff,	400
Kincardine, . .	J. M. Bell,	300	Forfar,	C. Dickson,	500
Kirkcudbright, .	E. D. Sandford, . .	300	Dundee,	J. Henderson, . . .	500
Lanark,	Sir A. Alison, Bart.,	1000	Haddington, . . .	R. Riddell,	400
			Inverness, . . .	W. H. Colquhoun, .	450
Linlithgow, . .	John Cay,	300	Fort-William, . .	A. Fraser,	350
Orkney and }			Skye,	T. Fraser,	300
Zetland, }	W. E. Aytoun, . . .	350	Long Island, . .	C. Shaw,	300
Peebles,	G. Napier,	300	Kincardine, . . .	C. G. Robertson, . .	400
Perth,	J. Craufurd,	400	Kirkcudbright, .	W. H. Dunbar, . . .	400
Renfrew,	H. J. Robertson, . .	350	Glasgow,	H. G. Bell,	600
Ross and }			Do,	G. Skene,	600
Cromarty, }	T. Mackenzie, . . .	400	Lanark,	J. N. Dyce,	400
Roxburgh, . . .	W. O. Rutherford, .	300	Hamilton,	J. Veitch,	400
Selkirk,	G. Dundas,	300	Airdrie,	A. Smith,	400
Stirling,		350	Linlithgow, . . .	F. Home,	400
Sutherland, . . .	H. Lumsden,	300	Kirkwall,	J. Robertson, . . .	400
Wigtown,	A. Urquhart,	300	Lerwick,	R. Bell,	350
			Peebles,	A. Burnet,	350
			Perth,	H. Barclay,	500
			Dunblane,	A. Cross,	350
			Paisley,	R. R. Glasgow, . . .	450
			Greenock,	C. Marshall,	400
			Tain,	R. S. Taylor,	350
			Dingwall,	G. Cameron,	350
			Stornoway,	A. L. Macdonald, . .	300
			Roxburgh,	J. M. Craigie, . . .	450
			Selkirk,	F. Sommerville, . . .	350
			Stirling,	Sir J. Hay, Bart., .	450
			Falkirk,	R. Robertson, . . .	400
			Dornoch,	E. Fraser,	450
			Wigtown,	M. Rhind,	400

Deducting Edinburgh and Glasgow, where the Sheriffs are both resident, the total paid to the Scottish Sheriffs is £9350, and to their Substitutes £21,700.

The salaries of the Sheriff-substitutes are pronounced to be "perfectly ludicrous." "The present salaries of the resident Sheriffs (substitutes) are perfectly ludicrous; and, as we have already shewn, the result is that no person can accept such a situation except he possesses some means of his own, to enable him to keep up his necessary position as a judge."—*Scotch County Courts*, p. 58. It is bad policy at all times to exaggerate. It weakens a good argument, and gives to injustice an excuse. It is ridiculous to say that the salaries of the Sheriff-substitutes, which are all greater than the average incomes of the Scottish clergy, and of the great majority of professional men, are at the starvation point. It is also incorrect to state, that none but persons blessed with an inherited fortune can accept the office. It must be known to the writer of the quoted passage, that for every vacancy, however unimportant, a dozen eager hands are held up. But far be it from us to say one word against the just claims for an increase of salary on the part of our local judges. Unhappily for themselves they have rested the solution of this point upon questions perilling national interests, in reference to which the deliberate judgment of educated men, as set forth in the report of two Royal Commissioners, is against them. We deplore the want of tactics that has ruined a good cause; for although we cannot certify the truth of the whole of the following passage, it does convey a description of much real suffering:—

"No man with any thing like a fair business at the Bar, and who enjoyed good health, would ever dream of accepting the office of Sheriff-substitute; and no one, with even a chance of ultimate success in his profession, would think of throwing himself away on such a situation; except, perhaps, he possessed some means of his own, which, along with the scanty emoluments of his office, might enable him to live on his salary. It is utterly impossible for him to maintain that position which the very decency, to say nothing even of his official situation, demands, and which, for the honour and credit of the country, a resident Sheriff ought to occupy. His labour is incessant, and his responsibility almost overwhelming, yet his salary is not half as much as is given to the higher officials in banks, or railway or insurance companies, or even to the head-clerk of a mercantile establishment. The salaries of the Sheriff-clerks, and of the Procurators Fiscal, in all the counties of Scotland, are higher than that of the Sheriff-substitute; and as they are not debarred from carrying on an extensive private

business, their professional incomes are often three or four times as much as that of the resident judge. Only a very small portion of the labours of a Sheriff-substitute meets the eye of the public. His duties on the bench are comparatively light to those off it. In all our populous districts, even on those days when there is no public Court, the resident Sheriff is kept in an incessant turmoil of business, by criminal matters and summary proceedings; and in those counties where he has some leisure on his hands, he is, nevertheless, prevented from making a profitable use of it, and yet is obliged to keep up a position in society which his salary is totally inadequate to sustain."

We have, however here to deal with the Sheriffs-Principal, in reference to whom the question raised is, whether their services are worth to this country £9350 a-year? The amount is not large for a great country. It is not beyond that exacted by Mr. Moore, the registrar of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury. Still it is too large if the office be a "sinecure." (*Scotch County Courts*, p. 65.) We do not admire the taste which dictated the remark, because we cannot imagine the author to be ignorant of a Sheriff's duties. It is always more easy to destroy than to construct, to denounce than to defend. More peculiarly it is so, in a case where the vices of a system are capable of a summary exposition, while its merits are spread over a large surface, and require at once some fairness to appreciate and some professional training to understand.

The statement was repeated by a committee of Dumfries-shire gentlemen, who have given to the public the benefit of a report. They expanded it by stating that the Sheriffs are prevented "from having any communication with their counties save at rare intervals. Upon the Substitute devolves the whole of the business." Asailed in this way, Mr. Napier, the Sheriff of Dumfries-shire, comes forth with the following statement of a Sheriff's duties:—

"The publication of this somewhat reckless assertion will not a little astonish the Sheriffs of Scotland. If by 'communication with their counties' be understood, that familiarization at the elbow, which is so apt to reduce a judge to the level of a legal assessor, unquestionably the Sheriffs rather seek to avoid that position. Their proper communication with the county does not consist in their constant attendance upon county gentlemen at county meetings. They are *ex officio* Commissioners of Supply, and occasionally attend those meetings, and constitute them, out of respect to the county gentlemen, and that they may be in communication with them, when necessary, upon proper Fiscal subjects. But the communication which consists in becoming the consulting colleague and legal adviser of those few active county

gentlemen who continually attend to county business, is that which is most apt to deteriorate the position of a Judge. It is the reverse of his duty. It throws him into great confidence with one gentleman, and, it may be, into unpleasant collision with another. And supposing him to be equally in such confidence with them all, his relation to those county gentlemen becomes almost unfairly distinguished from his relation to the general community, over whom he is simply *Judge*. This affords one strong argument in favour of what your Committee have called 'Double Sheriffs.'

"To judge of the duties of a Sheriff, he must be regarded in relation to his *Sheriffdom*, and not merely to his *Sheriff Court*. Even in reference to his ordinary Civil Court, the matter is inaccurately stated by your Committee. A Sheriff does not *hear* appeals. The advantage of his position is, that a record of written pleadings, along with his Substitute's judgment, is transmitted to him, at the head-quarters of the law, where, besides being free from all local prejudices and predilections, he brings to the consideration of the case, the experience of his own practice, and of the practice of his friends; and, in general, a more extended and liberal knowledge of the practical working of the law of Scotland, than a local resident judge can be expected to acquire."—Pp. 16, 17.

To what extent the right of review is exercised it is difficult to state, purely because of the want of recent Parliamentary returns. A lamented Sheriff, now no more, informed the writer that in one year he presided at 61 criminal trials, pronounced 353 judgments in civil cases, and left Edinburgh 17 times in the course of the year for his county. His salary was £400. It is not extravagant pay if a lawyer get several guineas for conducting a criminal trial, and at the very least £2, 2s. for his opinion on a civil case; and yet the pay given to this Sheriff did not come to a guinea a-piece for each trial and each judgment, leaving out of view the £50 he would have to pay for his travelling expenses for the 17 journeys, and the loss of business in the meantime consequent upon his absence from Edinburgh. We believe that the business of that county has since increased.

Besides these civil duties, there is a great criminal jurisdiction which is thus described :—

"But this appellate jurisdiction is but *one portion* of the onerous duties, and high responsibilities, of a Sheriff in Scotland. He has to take especial charge of the *criminal* jurisdiction of his county; that department through which the public mind is most apt to be excited, and the public peace, of which the Sheriff himself has the whole responsibility, to be disturbed. In some instances, where, from the vicinity of his *Sheriffdom*, access to it is very easy, the Sheriff generally presides in all those cases which

are tried with a jury. And if the case happen to be one of importance, attracting public attention, or likely to create any local excitement, a Sheriff considers it his duty to go to his county, specially to try it, however distant, and at any personal inconvenience. This is no light task, or slender tie to his duties; especially of late years, when the Crown lawyers have been in the habit of sending so many serious cases to be tried before the Sheriff and a Jury. A knowledge of the readiness and zeal of the Sheriffs so to act, has encouraged the Crown authorities to do this: which of course relieves not a little the Commission of Justiciary. Again to quote my own instance, which is that of a county so distant as to render it impossible for me, consistently with remaining at the Bar, to preside in every criminal Jury trial, my Procurator-Fiscal has been always instructed to report to me every case ordered for trial in that form, that I may judge whether the case require that I should try it. I am fortunate in a county not very prolific of *Causes Célèbres*. But I have had arduous duty, from time to time, on the criminal bench of Dumfries-shire; and I am not aware of having failed to undertake any criminal case of importance, or likely to involve any local excitement, since I was appointed to the jurisdiction."—Pp. 17, 18.

In reference to the personal intercourse held by a Sheriff with his county, Mr. Napier gives this as the history of his own experience :—

"Irrespective of that particular attention to the criminal business of his Court, to which I have already adverted, calling him from time to time specially to his county, a Sheriff is, by Act of Parliament, bound to hold in person four ordinary Courts in each half year, and to report each year to the Secretary of State the number of cases, civil or criminal, so disposed of by him in his county. This secures his *personal presence there*, at least twice a-year. The business of these Statutory Courts varies according to circumstances. It is a matter of no consequence to the argument, whether at any given time, it be light or heavy. In Dumfries-shire, I have frequently disposed of the business of one of these Courts within an hour; and, upon other occasions, I have sat on the criminal bench from eight to twelve hours at a time. But no Sheriff ever considers the statutory requisite, of reporting that he has held eight Courts within the year, as affixing any limit whatever to the exercise of his judicial functions. It secures, as I have said, his presence in the county at least twice a-year—a circumstance of itself sufficient to contradict your Committee's statement. But whatever case, or whatever crisis, *specially* calls for his presence, that is never withheld. Then, the Sheriff must be in various parts of his county at other times. He has to sit in the Courts of Registration, which are not reckoned in the eight Courts reported to Government: He has to attend the Judges twice a-year on the Circuit: He is rarely absent at the proclamation of an election; and scarcely ever if it be contested: He has to inspect lunatic asylums, and jails, and

to report upon the state of the county records. Such are the various occasions which secure for the county, not only the *regular*, but the *frequent* personal presence of its Sheriff. But his 'communication,' with the county, is far from ceasing with the occasions I have enumerated. Is it no *communication* to have to *rejudge* in the whole civil business of the ordinary Court? Is it no *communication*, when absent, to be every now and then in correspondence, either with the Sheriff-Substitute, the Sheriff-Clerk, the Procurator-Fiscal, the Convener of the County, the Clerk of Supply, or the Superintendent of Police? As the fair statement of the case, it may be said, that a Sheriff in Scotland has *never his eye off his county*. And it would be anything but a sound argument for dispensing with his office, as constituted, that a Sheriff is not always at the head of a *Posse Comitatus*, or at the side of a county gentleman."—Pp. 19, 20.

We defend not scandalous appointments or inefficient discharge of duty; but we object to the exception being taken as the rule. It is perfectly true that the office of Sheriff is often given to lawyers who are political partisans. It is sometimes true that it is given as the reward merely of political partisanship, without reference to law. This is the misfortune of the peculiar Government under which we live, and the peculiar condition of the parties who alternately reign in high places. We are a jobbing and canvassing people, with a tendency to put the rule of merit out of the question. A Minister requires to be backed by hordes of enthusiastic followers, and cannot retain his position without their votes. To secure these, an imperative necessity requires him to disperse his patronage among his friends. It would be extravagant simplicity to expect that that man who can see no virtue in the Minister or his measures, and whose whole life is occupied with holding him up to scorn, should be appointed to a lucrative office for which a hundred eager friends are clamorous. It is not therefore because political friends are nominated to these offices that just objection can be taken, but because *that* is their only merit. If such appointments have been made, they are a disgrace alike to the giver and the receiver, and that they have been made is only affording a proof that this office, like every other in a constitutional monarchy, from that of Prime Minister down to the lowest official in our Courts of justice has been jobbed. An Autocrat like the Czar of Russia, or he of France, can afford to disregard all other considerations save merit. No political parties exist in these countries to prevent the selection of the uninfluential man of talent. We must however reap the tares with the oats. If we must be governed not by des-

pots but by parties, we must govern to the last as a jobbing and bribing people.

A manifesto has issued from Glasgow in which the conditions are laid down upon which the Substitutes are to retire. They have "intimated to the Lord Advocate, that in so far as they are concerned, they are willing to place their present offices at the disposal of the Government, on the understanding that the patrimonial rights of existing incumbents will be protected in those cases in which the new appointment of resident Sheriff is not conferred on them." In other words, the Substitutes, if they do not obtain promotion, are to have salaries without labour. With the national exchequer behind them they may return to their old avocations as writers or advocates, unless they fear a repetition of the evil fortune that drove them first away. In that event have they not all that pleasure has of allurements—all that indolence can offer of soothing satisfaction—all the gratifications that a fixed salary for life can deck out in the gayest and most enchanting colours? A man generally looks to a settled income and a charming *entresol* at Capua, or a winter on the shores of the Mediterranean, only after a life of painful industry, and as to some bright object in the distant future, which it requires even a strong flight of imagination to reach. How peacefully life would flow on undistracted by anxieties as to the morrow! It is hard after this, for those who are to be left behind, to acquiesce in their own prospect of weary labour, self-denial, and an abnegation of the softer lights and shadows of existence. Yet the offer is introduced in the spirit of a party, who is granting something for which the receiver should be thankful. It is said to have been made to the Lord Advocate by the "Sheriff-Substitutes as a body, with most commendable public spirit," and apparently not without some look to private advantage.

We are unwilling to encumber a paper intended for general readers with technical details. We believe that measures are prepared, by which much of the cumbrous machinery in Sheriff Court forms of process will be remedied—the means of taking evidence improved—written supplanted by oral pleadings, and generally a shortening made of the proceedings between the commencement of the suit and its close. The delays which now occur in working the Sheriff Courts, are entirely put to the door of the principal Sheriff. They are, on the contrary, the result of, in many respects, the neglect of duty of the Sheriff-Substitute himself. The great difficulty in regulating Courts of

Justice is to preserve the right of appeal, and to take the evidence in the best form. The practice hitherto has been to set down what the witnesses say in writing, and the Judge of appeal determines the case upon a perusal of this written proof. The evil of the system lies upon the surface—the man of virtue and the man of vice, the truth-teller and the liar, speak in print with equal plausibility. There is wanting a test and guarantee for truth. The Judge is unassisted by the tone, the manner, the looks of the witness, as he tells his story. No means exist to tell how the witness faltered and shuffled with the questions, nor to carry to the mind the overpowering conviction of utter unreality, consequent on the view and bearing of the *tout ensemble*.

Hence the superiority of *viva voce* examinations in open Court. The Sheriff-Substitutes, however, while they are obliged to record the proof, have doubled its evil. They are enjoined to take that proof themselves. But instead of this, even those who have leisure remit to a third party to do so, and, as if they were Judges of appeal, they pronounce their decree merely after reading the recorded evidence. The first improvement, therefore, is to compel at least one of the Judges to see the witnesses. We see nothing to prevent the Sheriff sitting in open Court, and there taking down the proof with his own hand, as is now done by the Supreme Judges. Many of those who now fill the office of Substitutes are, it is said, unfit for a task requiring much skill and patience. We must not, however, legislate merely in reference to present temporary evils; let us look forward to a race of good lawyers, capable of every judicial duty, and to procure whom, it is only necessary to give a reasonable income to tempt them from the bar. If the Sheriff be not allowed to take down the evidence himself—the taking of which at present constitutes the worst and most

expensive portion of Sheriff-Court procedure, we beg to make a suggestion, founded on the practice of the House of Lords; Let there be attached to every Sheriff-Court a shorthand writer, to put down the very words of the witness as fast as the witness utter them. This sworn and paid officer could thus preserve, for the benefit of a Court of review, the record of what took place at the trial; and what is of equal consequence, would take it down far more impartially and far more correctly than the Judge himself. The Sheriff, often unintentionally, would omit points running counter to his own view of the case; and an unprincipled, or a cunning Judge, would do so in order to escape the scourge of a review.

In the progress of a country's laws, a crisis invariably arrives, when their mixed elements of good and evil, of enduring and perishable material, are winnowed and divided. The flail of the thresher and the fan of the winnower are at this moment busily engaged in this necessary duty; and if cautiously done, our children may look to our times as to the commencement of a new era. But suppose the Sheriff Courts uprooted, what then? Does the Court of Session follow? and will Mr. Justice A., and Mr. Baron B., from England, be sent to rule over us? A great event is always a beginning and an end; it ends a campaign or a controversy, a suit in law or in love, a dynasty or a party; but it begins a new state of things with its cogenital difficulties and sorrows. The novelist marries his hero, and closes the third volume; but then begins a new career, more important in its responsibilities, and more enduring in its effects. It must be so in a still greater degree with regard to organic changes in a nation's laws, which touch every nerve of social life, and which are, or ought to be,—morals applied to the circumstances of private individuals.

915

37

